

THESE VITAL SPEECHES

THE BEST OF THE 2018 CICERO SPEECHWRITING AWARDS

GRAND AWARD

- 3 "The Power of a Story," by Matthew Kivel for Gregory L. Fennes, President, The University of Texas at Austin

CATEGORY WINNERS

- 6 AGRICULTURE: "Even If People Can't Move Freely, Ideas Must," by Chris Moran for Jack Payne, Senior Vice President for Agriculture and Natural Resources, University of Florida
- 8 ENERGY: "Managing Oil Supply in an Unmanageable Market," written and delivered by Bob Tippee, Editor, *Oil & Gas Journal*
- 12 GOVERNMENT: "Seat Belts, State Budgets and the Art of Compromise," by John Patterson for John Cullerton, Illinois Senate President
- 14 INSURANCE: "The New Normal for Insurers and Brokers," by Lorne Christensen for David Fried, CEO, Emerging Markets, QBE Insurance
- 17 MEDIA: "Storytelling at National Geographic in the Digital Age," by Jack Dougherty for Susan Goldberg, Editorial Director, National Geographic Partners and Editor in Chief of *National Geographic Magazine*
- 21 MILITARY: "2017 Outstanding Veterans' Advocate Award," by Jacqueline Fearer for Will Hatley, Veterans Vocational Rehabilitation Specialist and Recipient of the 2017 Outstanding Veterans' Advocate Award
- 22 NONPROFIT: "The State of Civil Discourse," by David Goodstone and Mark Guarino for John Hewko, General Secretary, Rotary International
- 25 TRANSPORTATION: "Growing Global: Lessons Lived and Learned," by Janet Stovall for David Abney, Chairman and CEO, UPS
- 27 CONTROVERSIAL OR HIGHLY POLITICIZED TOPIC: "Protecting Human Rights in Today's Europe," by Katya Andrusz for Michael O'Flaherty, Director, European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights
- 30 DIVERSITY: "How We Can All Help End Domestic Violence and Abuse," by Craig Millar for Lubna Latif, Domestic Violence and Abuse Counsellor
- 32 ECONOMICS: "U.S. and Canada: Sharing a Continent by Chance; Friends by Choice," by Richard Roik for Jim Carr, Canadian Minister of Natural Resources
- 34 HEALTHCARE: "Those People," by Diane Suchetka for Dr. Akram Boutros, President and CEO, The MetroHealth System
- 37 LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT: "What the World Needs Now from Business," written and delivered by Dain Dunston, Author and Leadership Coach
- 39 PHILOSOPHY AND/OR RELIGION: "Search," written and delivered by Jeffrey Flint, President, Flint Speechwriting
- 41 RHETORIC AND COMMUNICATION: "Speechwriting: An Anglo-American Perspective," written and delivered by Hal Gordon, Freelance Speechwriter
- 46 TECHNOLOGY: "Living in the Glass Age," written by Judith Navoy for Dr. Jeffrey W. Evenson, Vice President and Chief Strategy Officer, Corning Incorporated
- 49 ANALYST CALL/INVESTOR MEETING: "Invest. Grow. Deliver," by Dean Foust for David Abney, Chairman and CEO, UPS
- 51 COMMENCEMENT/CONVOCATION ADDRESS: "Gold in the Bushes," by Jerry Wohletz for Dr. Gary Roberts, President, American Dental Association
- 52 EMPLOYEE MEETING: "Why the University of Florida Matters So Much to So Many," by Chris Moran for Jack Payne, Senior Vice President for Agriculture and Natural Resources, University of Florida
- 54 EULOGY/TRIBUTE SPEECH: "Freedom Adds Colour to Our Lives," by Johan Kroes for Jeanine Hennis-Plasschaert, Former Minister of Defence for the Second Rutte cabinet, The Netherlands
- 56 FAREWELL/RESIGNATION SPEECH: "Vulnerability, Curiosity, Courage," by Jan Sonneveld for Jet Bussemaker, Minister of Education, Culture and Science, The Netherlands
- 58 INAUGURAL SPEECH: "What Kind of Leaders Will We Be?" by Leanne Boyer for Dr. David O. Barbe, President, American Medical Association
- 61 MOTIVATIONAL SPEECH: "Think Big. Act Small. Start Somewhere," by Antonie van Campen for Tom Middendorp, Former Chief of Defence, The Netherlands
- 64 STATE-OF-THE-INSTITUTION SPEECH: "Tomorrow's Industries from Today's Science," by Jenna Daroczy for Dr. Larry Marshall, Chief Executive, Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Australia

SEE
HONORABLE MENTIONS,
INSIDE FRONT COVER

HONORABLE MENTION

“When the United States Sneezes ...,” by Felicity H. Barber
for John Williams, President and CEO, Federal Reserve Bank
of San Francisco

“Is Scouting Still Relevant in Today’s World?” by Ed Markey
for Richard J. Kramer, Chairman, CEO and President,
The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company

“Unpacking Sentences for Clarity and Impact,” written and
delivered by Stanley Dambroski, Public Affairs Specialist,
National Science Foundation

“We’ve Got You Covered, UCF Marching Knights,” by Joe
Adams for Dr. John C. Hitt, President, University of Central
Florida

“How Far We’ve Come,” by Lucinda Trew for Greg Ebel, CEO,
Spectra Energy

“Esteves, This Is Your Moment: Go Ahead and Jump,” by Teresa
Zumwald for Harold Fentener van Vlissingen, Chairman of the
Board, Diamond Tools Group

GRAND AWARD WINNER

"The Power of a Story"

By Matthew Kivel for Gregory L. Fenves,
President, The University of Texas at Austin



Delivered as acceptance speech for Guardian of the Human
Spirit Award, Hilton Americas, Houston, Nov. 2, 2017

[After being introduced by University of Texas System Regent Janiece Longoria.]

Thank you, Janiece for that beautiful introduction. This is a special day for The University of Texas at Austin, and it is only fitting that you—a distinguished alumna, a UT System regent and one of our university's greatest supporters, should be here to make this moment possible. Thank you for your sincere words. Thank you for your leadership. And thank you for your friendship.

It is an honor to be in Houston, along with so many of the Longhorn family and leaders of the city and the state of Texas.

The resilience of the people of Houston after Hurricane Harvey has been an example to the world, and this museum embodies their spirit. The motto "Houston Strong" is not just a couple of words, but a way of life in this great city.

I am humbled to be recognized by Holocaust Museum Houston. The work that you do is vital. You teach. You preserve. You enable us to remember and learn. I want to say thank you to every Museum staff member and, especially, to the many volunteers. I am very grateful.

In our busy lives, and in this noisy and complicated world, the Museum is a place for remembrance. We remember through stories.

Each of you here has a story—a life, a family, a history—that is unique. We take our own paths. We make difficult decisions. We fall in love. We choose careers. We leave behind a legacy that is our own. And in this country, we have a longstanding belief in the power of the individual. A belief that our lives are the result of—well, us.

But the reality is that our lives are not only the product of our ambitions, our talents, and a singular focus. Our lives unfold as our individual story intertwines with the stories of others—it's happening right now, while we are in this room together.

That is why institutions like The University of Texas at Austin and Holocaust Museum Houston are important. They make sense of these intersections. To educate, to understand, to enlighten and to bring people together with diverse perspectives and backgrounds so that we may improve lives for present and future generations.

As president of UT—seeing our students create their own stories on the Forty Acres—you will rarely find me talking about myself. I want to hear what they're working on. What they're learning. It's not about me or my family. It's about them and their future.

But upon receiving this honor on behalf of The University of Texas at Austin, I feel a need to speak more personally than I am used to.

We are living through a time when our nation is experiencing acts—even movements—fueled by hatred, racism, anti-Semitism, anti-Muslim and anti-gay sentiments, and discrimination towards immigrants on college campuses and in our communities.

We must denounce these negative forces. They are inhumane and simply un-American.

Too many people do not understand what hatred can lead to—especially organized, legitimized hatred.

That is why we must remember. Remember through our stories.

So today, I want to tell you a story. A story that helps define who I am, and a story about our nation—my father's story.

When I was about 8 years old, I came home one Sunday from Hebrew school. On that morning, the teacher had taught the class about the Holocaust. But as an 8-year-old, I don't think I really got it.

When I came home, I'm sure I wanted to eat quickly and then go outside to play. But while having lunch, I told my mother about what I had heard in school—probably in a typical 8-year-old tone.

At some point, my mother said something like: "We've never told you this before, but your dad lived through the Holocaust." That was the first time I learned my dad was a survivor.

On Sundays, my dad would take a nap to escape from four wild kids. This Sunday, after speaking with my mom, I clearly remember going into his room, looking at my dad sleeping—to see a number tattooed on his outstretched arm. Seeing that tattooed number for the first time is something I will never forget.

My father is a Holocaust survivor.

For my entire professional career, I never talked about my dad's story outside of our family. Not because of how emotional it is. Not because of how personal it is. But it was his story, and it was our family's story. It didn't have anything to do with being an engineering professor.

But my responsibility is different as president of The University of Texas at Austin.

It has been 72 years since the end of World War II and the liberation of the Nazi concentration camps. The number of Holocaust survivors continues to decrease. And soon, they will not be here to tell their own stories themselves—beyond the oral histories many have made.

These stories are important today, and they will be important forever

because the darkest moments in history can repeat themselves.

My dad and his sister Eszti grew up in a prosperous upper-middle class, Jewish-Hungarian family in Subotica—a town in a province of Yugoslavia with a large Hungarian population. My grandfather, Louis, served in the army of the Austrian-Hungarian Empire during World War I—and later with his brother, published the most influential Hungarian-language newspaper in the province. The family lived in a large apartment above their newspaper offices and printing plant.

My grandmother, Klara, was a graphic artist who had traveled throughout Europe as an art student. My dad grew up trilingual, speaking Hungarian at home, Serbian in school, and—because of his German governess—he learned German as well.

In April of 1941, as an ally of Germany, Hungary invaded Yugoslavia, and Subotica fell under occupation. My dad was 9 years old.

The Hungarian anti-Jewish laws were immediately put into effect, and my grandfather was led out of his newspaper office at gunpoint, and the business was transferred to a non-Jewish administrator. The family had to sell all of their possessions, including my father's prized stamp collection, for money to survive. They were forced to live in one corner of their apartment while Hungarian military officers took over the rest of the home.

This dehumanizing process of confiscation and subjugation had happened to Jews all over Europe and was now happening to the Hungarian Jews. They lost their rights as citizens, and the lives that they had built over generations were instantly taken away.

As the next three years passed, life for my dad's family became increasingly desperate, culminating in the deportation of Hungarian Jews.

To put this in a historical perspective, for Germany, the war was all but lost. The American and British armies had landed in France on D-Day. American and other forces were moving up the Italian peninsula. And the

Soviet army was advancing from the east. There was no hope of Germany surviving the onslaught of Allied forces. But the Nazis were so dedicated, and single-mindedly focused on annihilating the Jews, that they continued to deport Jews and operate the death camps to the very end of the war.

So, in 1944, my dad and his family were loaded onto a transport train—a train car built to hold freight—that was packed with hundreds of people.

They did not know where they were going. There was no food or water. The train just kept moving. My dad was 13 years old.

Finally, days later, the train stopped. The doors opened, and the people were ordered to get off. They were at their final destination: Auschwitz.

The guards took hold of the passengers. Within minutes, they selected my great-grandmother to die in the gas chamber. My grandmother Klara was taken into one of the compounds, and my dad and Eszti were put in “youth blocks” in two other compounds.

The average time a person would survive in Auschwitz was four days—my dad would go on to spend five months there.

He survived by using the German language that his governess taught him—acting as an interpreter for the officials who were shopping for slave labor, and for the Polish political prisoners who were the overseers in the compounds.

He worked on a roof repair detail that was allowed to go from compound to compound. In one of these, he saw his sister Eszti who told him that their mother had died. On another visit, he brought Eszti food and warm clothing, paid for by trading trinkets on the black market.

By the late fall of 1944, rumors circulated through Auschwitz that the Germans were planning to exterminate all remaining prisoners, including the children, before the Soviet forces arrived.

With this news, the Polish underground, who had a strong presence within Auschwitz, began smuggling

people out in frantic attempts to save as many lives as possible.

I want to take a moment to recognize the bravery of those who resisted the Nazis. History does not often reflect how Jews and other targeted groups fought back. This was at a time when they had no rights, no property, and the slightest infraction was punished by death. Still, they fought back. They organized and resisted. And those resistance fighters saved my dad's life.

The Polish underground hatched a plan to smuggle my dad out on a transport, where he might have a chance to survive.

Keep in mind, my dad was barely a teenager. And because of his young age, he would never have been selected to work in a slave labor camp. The underground knew this, and coached him to tell the Germans a number of plausible reasons why he would be on a transport from Auschwitz.

One day, as prisoners who had been selected for work lined up, the underground slipped my dad into the line. He was crammed into the train car.

He didn't know that it was bound for a satellite camp of Buchenwald near Weimar in Germany.

After three days on the train, my dad arrived in the small town of Niederorschel with about 300 other slave laborers. They were going to be forced to work at a small factory, making aircraft wings for Messerschmitt fighter planes.

An SS guard gave a talk to the group, and just before they were dismissed, the guard went up to my dad and said, “What are you doing here? I didn't select you.”

The guard had recognized my dad from Auschwitz and knew that he wasn't supposed to be there. The underground hadn't prepared him for this scenario. But my dad thought quickly and said to the guard—“Well sir, with all of these new inmates, they thought that you would need another interpreter.” The SS guard, miraculously, agreed. My dad was able to go into the factory.

He would spend the remaining months of World War II as a slave

laborer, alongside other enslaved Jews and Russian prisoners of war. They were barely fed, and their lives consisted of nothing more than a daily walk from the barracks to the factory, hours of labor, and back for sleep.

Even with the life being worked out of them, they resisted. The workers would sabotage the wiring in the wings of the fighters so the landing gear would retract after takeoff, but upon landing, the wheels wouldn't lower and the planes would crash. They risked their own lives to ensure that someday, the Nazis would be defeated.

In April of 1945, Gen. Patton's Third Army was rapidly powering through central Germany as Allied forces converged on Berlin. The Nazis were trying to hide the evidence of the camps. So, they evacuated Niederorschel through a forced march to the main camp 65 miles away—Buchenwald.

Many died along the way. And during the journey, my dad was confronted by a guard, beaten, and his arm was severely broken. He was very ill, but he made it to Buchenwald. Upon arriving, he collapsed and passed out in one of the barracks.

When my dad came to, he was among American soldiers of the 6th Armored Division. American soldiers were liberating the camp. He had survived.

In the weeks that followed, my dad, still 13 years old, had a choice—to declare himself a refugee and face an even more unknown future, or return to his hometown in Yugoslavia, with the hope of seeing his family again.

He chose to go home, and when he got there, he found Eszti had survived Bergen-Belsen, my grandfather Louis had barely survived as a slave laborer in a Silesian coal mine, and two of his cousins had made it through as well. My grandfather was deathly ill and would die a few months later. But before he died, he wrote a letter to a friend living in New York.

My grandfather expressed his hope that his children would move to America. He believed that in the

United States, his children would be given an opportunity to flourish—to lead happy, productive lives. My dad never forgot this message, and he still has his father's letter.

My dad, my aunt Eszti, and their cousins went on to escape what was by then communist Yugoslavia. They ended up in Paris, which was in chaos after the war and flooded with refugees from across Europe. They lived in a Hungarian slum near the Sorbonne that is now a prosperous neighborhood on the Left Bank. My dad learned French and excelled in high school. He and Eszti were able to get American immigration visas, and they arrived in Chicago in 1950.

And then another uniquely American story unfolded. After a couple of years, my dad was drafted into the U.S. Army during the Korean War. His unit was preparing for deployment to Korea, but at the last minute, the orders were changed ... and he became part of the U.S. Occupation Forces in Germany. Only seven years after being liberated by the same army in the same country.

My dad has always said that he learned what it is to be an American during his time in the Army—that it was where he truly became an American.

But I think he understood what this nation was about long before, when he was at Buchenwald, opening his eyes to see U.S. soldiers caring for the sick and the dying. Fighting for justice. He saw that then.

When he brought his sister food and clothing at Auschwitz, he was already an American. When he helped sabotage German planes in a slave labor camp, he was already an American. And when he came to this nation for the first time as a refugee, he was already an American. The American spirit is not bound by blood, skin color, religion, or place of origin—it is based on a set of ideals found within courageous people.

My dad was honorably discharged from the Army, and his service earned him a path to U.S. citizenship and a

college education through the G.I. Bill. While in college, he met and married my mom, Norma, his wife of 62 years, and they raised those four rambunctious kids. My dad would go on to become a renowned professor of engineering, being elected to the National Academy of Engineering at the remarkably young age of 45.

I have one more story.

In 1995, my dad and I were together in Berlin for an engineering conference—where he was giving a keynote address. It was unusual for us to be at a professional event together. But this one had special meaning because it was in Berlin 50 years after the liberation.

One afternoon, I decided to skip the conference sessions. I took the S-Bahn to the western suburbs of Berlin, then transferred to a local bus that drove through a forest to a large villa. The bus came to a stop and the driver loudly announced “Wannsee Haus.” Everyone on the bus watched this one person, me, an American, get off, and I could tell they knew why I was there.

I went through the exhibits of the Wannsee House, which had recently opened as a museum, and saw the documents from the meeting in 1942, where the Nazi's planned what they called, “the final solution to the Jewish question in Europe.” It was a powerful moment in my life, to stand face to face with the evidence of the evil that had erased much of my family and millions of others from the Earth.

After our conference ended in Berlin, my dad and I drove through the east German countryside to the places he had been taken to half a century before.

We went to the gleaming white train station in Niederorschel, where he had arrived in the harsh winter of 1945. We saw the small factory across the train tracks, the same factory where he had been enslaved. And while driving from Niederorschel, we retraced the path of the march that nearly took his life on the way to Buchenwald.

As we walked around the desolate hill of Buchenwald, my dad—with

his superb memory—showed me the places he had been in those few days before the liberation and in the months afterward as he recovered.

At one point, we came across a group of teenagers on a tour. And he talked with them.

I have a photograph of that moment—my dad in full professor mode, standing on a slight mound, with teenagers around him, pointing out the organization and features of Buchenwald.

I think about that photograph. I think about how far my dad came in his life, surviving fascism and escaping communism. What he endured. How

courageous he is. How much he has brought to the world.

I think of something else, too. I see in that photograph my dad's arm extended, pointing into the distance of the deserted death camp. And I think about how his arm is still broken, from that forced march—how it never really healed. There is a part of him that will always be shaped by the horrific experiences he endured as a boy. That will never fully heal.

But then I think: Look what he did with that arm. Throughout his life, as he did that afternoon in Buchenwald, he took it and lifted it up to show others, to teach others, to tell them the

truth, so they could better understand themselves, their history, and what human beings—both courageous and evil—are capable of.

By understanding his story, we understand our own story, as individuals, as a society, and as a nation. That is the power of a story.

So now, I'd like to dedicate this award that you have generously given to me, to my dad, Steven Fenves.

He is here with us. And I can't think of anyone I know who embodies this award more than him. Dad, if you could please come up here ...

Thank you all so much.

WINNER: AGRICULTURE

"Even If People Can't Move Freely, Ideas Must"

By Chris Moran for Jack Payne, Senior Vice President for Agriculture and Natural Resources, University of Florida

Delivered at Reitz Union, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, Feb. 15, 2017

Good afternoon, everyone, and congratulations to Bill, Gene, and Luke, three extraordinary faculty members we're here to recognize today.

It's really important to celebrate their work because just by being here today, we're all making a statement about what we value.

Has it ever been more important than right now, this month, to stand up for international engagement?

A few hundred meters from here, in Frazier Rogers, we have a young researcher with expertise in both computer science and agrometeorology. She came to UF in October to help Gerritt Hoogenboom develop software that predicts weather patterns and the resulting effects on crop yield.

But since January 28, she's been presented with a terrible choice of science or family.

Nasrin Salehnia is Iranian. She had never left her country before October. Her husband gave up a job to come with her. Her four-year-old son Kian misses grandma, who was essentially

raising him in Iran while Nasrin and her husband worked and studied.

Grandma needed heart surgery last month, and Nasrin and her family went back to see her through it. They returned on Jan. 27.

A day later, the president signed an executive order banning the entry of people from Iran and six other countries.

Nasrin had been talking with Gerritt about extending her six-month stay as a visiting scholar. She also had her eye on an opportunity at the University of Nebraska.

Now she doesn't know if visiting Iran will mean she can't come back. Her husband says he would not have agreed to come had he known this would happen. And grandma, Nasrin's mom, tells her by Skype: "They don't love you there. Why do you stay?"

Science is hard enough without this kind of heartbreak!

Nasrin is here with us today. Nasrin, we are so glad you're a part of IFAS! Would you and Sohrab and Kian please stand and be recognized?

Sometimes it seems science is getting even harder.

People reject a preponderance of evidence that the climate change is real and caused by human activity; that vaccinations don't cause autism; that genetically engineered food is as safe as conventionally produced food.

Politicians stoke this by bringing snowballs onto the floor of the United States Senate as "proof" that climate change is a hoax. Activists send our faculty, attorneys, and IT people on public record paper chases and cherry-pick from thousands of emails to create a fable that impugns our integrity. Social media trolls send death threats to our faculty.

And now, the collaboration on which good science depends is interrupted by rules that make your flag, not your C.V., what qualifies you to join our team in the search for truth.

Science is a global community. All six Americans who won Nobel prizes in science last year are immigrants.

Immigrants make incalculable contributions to IFAS: Dorota Haman and

Ramesh Reddy lead scores of scientists as department heads. Gbola Adesogan oversees a \$49 million effort to improve livestock production in six developing nations. Saqib Mukhtar, Eric Simonne, and Tim Momol travel tirelessly to support our work extending IFAS knowledge to native-born and foreign-born Floridians. Nian Wang may be the most likely scientist to find the silver bullet that slays citrus greening. World Food Prize winner Pedro Sanchez is building a scientific bridge from UF to his homeland of Cuba.

I'm proud of what President Fuchs had to say in his statement regarding the executive order on immigration:

"Embracing all members of our community and maintaining a welcoming environment for talented students and faculty from around the world are central to our values and identity as a university. It is also critical to excellence in education, research, economic development and other contributions to society."

IFAS Global is the purest expression of how we embody this in the agriculture and natural resources branch of our university. The land-grant mission of discovery, teaching, and Extension of knowledge does not stop at our border. It is our mission to bring science to those who benefit from it, whether they're across the street or across the ocean.

Today's honorees can be proud of the recognition because there are so many in IFAS who are doing great international work. For example, the UF International Center recognized Kirby Barrick and Robert McCleery of IFAS in October for their international work.

Could the two of you stand for a moment and be recognized?

These faculty members exemplify this ethos that knowledge has no borders. So do Luke Flory, Bill Guiliano, and Gene McAvoy.

Bill is in our Wildlife Ecology and Conservation Department. He has put IFAS on the map in the nation of Belize.

Bill knows it's in our self-interest as Americans to help other countries build their own capacity to protect natural resources. One of his nominators is a former doctoral student of his who is now Belize's secretary of agriculture and interior.

That means he has tremendous influence on what happens in the largest contiguous swath of rainforest north of the Amazon. That rainforest serves everyone on the planet, not just the people of Belize.

Every year Bill takes 40 students to Belize. He's preparing the future Florida and U.S. leaders in wildlife management and agriculture. We just happen to believe that the best preparation doesn't always occur in a classroom in Gainesville.

These trips for mostly undergraduates can change lives.

It did for Luke Flory. No, he didn't study under Giuliano, but it was a trip to the Amazon as an undergrad that sparked his interest in international issues.

When he became an ecologist, that interest turned into an imperative. Species move around the world through travel and trade. We need good science to determine how this affects biodiversity and how to conserve it.

Again, there's self-interest here. Luke's work can provide insights into threats that may be distant now but could someday make it to our shores.

Luke, too, leads student trips. His students' experiences in Cuba inform them about the management of Florida's resources.

Gene McAvoy has been all over the world. Now he's in LaBelle, a place you just won't find unless you're looking for it. My guess is he's one of the few people in Hendry County who know six languages!

Gene started his career in the Peace Corps. He's a firm believer that we do much more for world peace through agricultural development than we do with bombs.

That's why he organizes an inter-

national pepper conference every two years, hosts tours of foreign delegations, and brings what he knows to numerous international meetings.

His international experience also taught him, he says, that hungry people are angry people. Arab Spring is popularly portrayed as the expression of a thirst for freedom. But it was also driven by a hunger for bread.

Revolts in Egypt and Tunisia followed food price spikes that made it impossible for many families to afford adequate nutrition.

We value science as a way to build bridges, to protect the health of the planet, and to feed billions of people. We value the contributions that the scientists and students of other nations make to UF/IFAS.

The people in this room live those values. All of us can do that more effectively because of Rose Koenig, who leads IFAS Global. She's the first woman to lead our international arm in its 50-plus-year history.

That's worth noting, because we're founded on a land-grant mission that includes increasing opportunity for everyone. That means immigrants, racial minorities, low-income people, and women get a chance to learn and a chance to lead.

Our commitment to these ideals is what draws people like Nasrin to us. It's a good thing, because we need all the help we can get tackling challenges on the scale of climate change.

IFAS Global helps us live our values of helping people in other nations and learning from colleagues in those nations. By helping address problems abroad, perhaps we can reduce the chance of those problems migrating here.

Events beyond our control may prevent the free movement of people. Let's leave here today with renewed resolve to do everything we can to continue the free flow of ideas.

Thanks again for being here, and thank you, Bill, Gene, and Luke, for putting our ideals into practice.

WINNER: ENERGY

"Managing Oil Supply in an Unmanageable Market"

Written and delivered by Bob Tippee,
Editor, *Oil & Gas Journal*



Delivered at Pipeline + Energy Expo,
Tulsa, Oklahoma, April 5, 2017

“**B**read, butter, bacon, and beans.” Does anyone recognize that morsel of tasty alliteration?

It’s the slogan Oklahoma Governor William H. “Alfalfa Bill” Murray used in his campaign for the United States presidency in 1932.

Murray, of course, was running against Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and the rest is history.

I learned about Alfalfa Bill in an Oklahoma history class at the University of Tulsa many years ago and enjoyed hearing stories about him from old-timers in the Tulsa World newsroom early in my career.

So it seems only fitting, at a conference in Tulsa, to let a colorful character from Oklahoma’s past help me make a few points about cooperative management of supply in defense of the price of oil—and whether it can work under modern conditions.

Alfalfa Bill Murray was not someone easily discouraged by failure. He was persistent—rather as sponsors of supply management have been throughout the history of oil.

In fact, Alfalfa Bill moved to what was then Indian Territory in 1898 after failing as a newspaper publisher in Corsicana, Texas...then failing as a lawyer in Fort Worth...thereafter losing two campaigns for the Texas state senate.

He had better luck as a lawyer after moving north of the Red River and eventually became popular in the Chickasaw Nation.

When Indian Territory tried to become a state in 1905, he helped

write the constitution for the State of Sequoyah.

Technically, that undertaking failed, too. By then, though, Alfalfa Bill’s prominence as a frontier politician—enhanced by a gift for fiery oratory—had taken firm root in the windblown soil of what would become the State of Oklahoma two years later.

Elected to the House of Representatives in the state’s first legislature, Alfalfa Bill earned his nickname by fighting against business and for agriculture.

He ran for governor and lost in 1910 but ran for the US House and won in 1912. He served four years before losing his second bid for reelection—then returned to Oklahoma and lost another run for the governorship.

In 1920, he and a few family members and friends decamped to Bolivia, where they tried to create an agricultural colony. When that venture disintegrated, Alfalfa Bill returned to Oklahoma, where, in 1930, he finally succeeded in his quest to become governor.

I guess when you’re born in a place called Toadsuck, Texas, you learn to persevere.

The point Alfalfa Bill will help me make is that the oil market craves supply management, such as the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries has been trying since the beginning of this year to reinstate.

The market becomes chaotic when coordination breaks down—as it did two years and four months ago.

And the chaos fosters a yearning for some mechanism to limit supply.

In August of 1931, that mechanism was Governor William H. “Alfalfa Bill” Murray.

The Oklahoma Corporation Commission had been using proportional rationing—or prorationing—authorized by a 1915 law designed to prevent physical and economic waste—to keep crude prices from collapsing, in other words.

But big discoveries like the Seminole complex in 1926 and Oklahoma City field in 1928 kept swamping the market. The crude price plummeted. Lawsuits flew through courts like meadowlarks through marsh grass.

Then, in 1931, with competition growing from new, giant fields in Texas, and the crude price below 35 cents a barrel, a federal court rejected the Corporation Commission’s prorationing authority and suspended quotas.

With characteristic pugnacity and drama, Alfalfa Bill responded by sending National Guard troops into the oil fields to shut in more than 3,000 wells.

“The state’s natural resources must be preserved, and the price of oil must go to one dollar a barrel,” he said. “Now don’t ask me any more damned questions.”

This proved not to be Alfalfa Bill’s last declaration of martial law in Oklahoma’s oil fields. And it was not history’s first attempt to manage oil supply. Not by a long shot.

The painful tendency of crude oil prices to swing between extreme highs and lows began soon after Colonel Edwin Drake made what’s considered to be the first commercial oil discovery at Oil Creek, Pennsylvania, in 1859. A group of producers formed the Oil Creek Association trying to limit supply voluntarily.

The effort didn’t work. And the basic problem didn’t end—any more than it’s ended now.

Oil supply and oil demand dance to different tunes. Demand responds

slowly to price changes. And supply is lumpy—grotesquely so.

Natural depletion is always draining deposits in existing fields. Between discoveries, supply can fall below need. Shortage then raises the crude price and stimulates exploration and development.

Then discoveries and development previously uneconomic add supply out of proportion to demand. And surplus crushes the crude price.

John D. Rockefeller understood this wicked characteristic of the oil and gas business. Much of his motivation for monopolizing refining capacity and rail transport in the late 19th Century and early 20th Century was to protect his interests from price instability.

Popular distaste for Rockefeller's Standard Oil Trust, which was dismantled in 1911, set hard limits on political responses to the problem. Those sensitivities linger to this day.

Still, the effort persists—like Alfalfa Bill Murray, who didn't experiment with oil-supply management alone.

While he and the Oklahoma Corporation Commission were grappling with price instability, similar efforts to limit supply were under way in Texas and outside the United States.

Meeting in Achnacarry Castle in Scotland in 1928, leaders of several major oil companies had agreed to freeze market shares in the Middle East. We remember that deal as the As-Is Agreement.

Later, production restraint occurred through concession manipulations in the Middle East, Indonesia, and Venezuela by international majors known in infamy as the Seven Sisters.

In the United States, the Texas Railroad Commission was limiting supply first by controlling well-spacing but later—as giant discoveries poured new supply into the market—through prorationing.

In fact, Texas Governor Ross Sterling declared martial law in the Lone Star State's oil fields a couple weeks after Alfalfa Bill first did so here in Oklahoma.

Over time, and especially after World War II, Texas came to dominate American oil production, and the Railroad Commission became the principal mechanism for limiting supply. It received help from oil import fees and, in 1959, the Mandatory Oil Import Program.

By the early 1970s, the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries had formed, and production in the United States had peaked. Participation by Arab members of OPEC in a targeted oil embargo prompted by the Yom Kippur War of 1973 galvanized a shift in market control that was inevitable and lasting—at least so far.

For nearly all its history, then, the oil market has had something to control supply at the margin. When the control mechanism is missing or broken, oil prices tend to gyrate through extremes painful to consumers near the peaks and disastrous for producers in the troughs.

And through most of that history, voluntary production restraint has not worked for long and often has not worked at all.

To be effective, supply management needs official enforcement—such as, in Alfalfa Bill's day, soldiers checking gauges they didn't know how to read.

Inevitably, voluntary restraint falls victim to the doom of cartels: When a cartel succeeds, price elevation increases the temptation on participants to overproduce their quotas and spoil the effort.

Meanwhile, an oversupplied market finds ways around imposed bottlenecks the way a flooded creek flows around a boulder.

At its most successful, in fact, voluntary production restraint usually muddles along until something catastrophic lifts demand or extinguishes a major source of supply.

And, despite all the contingency and political suspicion, the oil market still craves supply management.

We saw powerful testimony to this observation in November 2014, when OPEC declared its intention no longer to choreograph production restraint.

A weak market panicked. And the

upstream oil and gas industry responded over the next couple of years with spending cuts that the International Energy Agency called unprecedented.

What matters most to the market, of course, is not spending but rather supply in relation to demand.

By the middle of last year, movement toward correction in that relationship was evident.

Demand was rising, and supply fell in the first half of 2016. Inventories in the industrialized world began falling from record-high levels last August.

But supply rebounded in last year's second half. And oil prices stayed below levels enabling rentier economies like those of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and the United Arab Emirates to balance national accounts.

After nearly a year of on-again, off-again discussions, OPEC ministers last November 30 announced a deal to cut crude oil production by an aggregate 1.2 million barrels a day for six months beginning this past January 1.

And on December 10, eleven non-OPEC producers agreed to trim production by a total of 558,000 barrels a day. Most importantly, Russia agreed to phase in production cuts to an eventual total of 300,000 barrels a day.

Discipline around each agreement probably depends on cohesion of the other.

Much is at stake.

The market's craving for supply management was evident not only in panic following OPEC's abandonment of production control in November 2014 but also after OPEC's announcement of new quotas last November.

The announcement added \$7 a barrel to the price of Brent crude. The decision by non-OPEC collaborators on December 10 added a further \$3 a barrel.

That's ten dollars a barrel the month before real supply restraint was to take effect—\$14.4 billion in extra revenue to OPEC and Russia in December for nothing more than two communiques.

The market rewarded an agreement to limit supply because—if you don't

believe me after I've said this so many times, take it from Alfalfa Bill Murray—the market craves supply management.

So what happens if the new deals unravel? Well, do you remember the months after November 2014?

If supply management fails, the question won't be whether the market punishes the oil price. The question will be how much.

I don't know if the production accords will hold together.

Crucial factors align themselves in three categories.

I've alluded to one of them already: market psychology.

Important as market psychology is to the price of oil, it inevitably yields to market fundamentals—supply and demand—the third category I'll discuss.

For now, market psychology is obsessed—appropriately—with quota discipline and related geopolitical intrigue.

Any agreement that includes Saudi Arabia and Iran, or Saudi Arabia and Russia, challenges diplomacy. In supply management of the moment, those relationships are points of vulnerability.

Still, the ability of Riyadh and Tehran to reach any agreement at all in November, after a bilateral dispute ruptured negotiations earlier in the year, suggests a possible thawing of relations.

Ultimately, Iran accepted what it earlier said it would not: a production ceiling. And Saudi Arabia accepted a ceiling for its adversary that allowed Iranian production to grow.

This came as the Saudis and Iranians resumed negotiations over the annual Muslim pilgrimage to Mecca—in which the Islamic Republic did not participate in 2016. And Kuwait, Iraq, and Oman recently have tried to mediate some degree of Saudi-Iranian rapprochement.

Russia, meanwhile, wants to expand its influence in the Middle East beyond alliances with Shia regimes in Tehran,

Baghdad, and Damascus and with Hezbollah, Iran's proxy in Lebanon.

In Syria, in fact, Moscow seems to have preempted Iranian and Hezbollah factions in support of Bashar al-Assad—to the irritation of the Islamic Republic.

To Vladimir Putin, the production agreement with OPEC might be a stratagem not only to boost the price of crude but also to curry favor with Sunni power centers—maybe even the House of Saud.

For its part, Saudi Arabia has extra motivation to pursue oil-price strength. The kingdom plans to float an IPO of 5 percent of Aramco next year. Concern about valuation of that interest might make Riyadh more patient than usual with Moscow and Tehran.

So while the diplomatic fragilities of any supply coordination involving OPEC and Russia remain in place, the internal forces may have aligned in ways that strengthen cohesion around the production accords—at least for now.

Ultimately, though, market fundamentals will prevail.

In its March Oil Market Report, the International Energy Agency said industrial-world oil stocks fell by 120 million barrels between August and December last year.

Alas, stocks rose by 48 million barrels in January and seem to have fallen only modestly in February—in large measure because of record-high output by Saudi Arabia and Russia just before the production agreements.

The market remains oversupplied. That will not quickly change.

Large offshore and oil sands projects begun before the price crash continue to come on stream.

Beyond competition from project momentum, supply managers face a new and nasty problem: The market has a lot of potential supply promptly available from unconventional resources.

In the past, production response to price elevation outside the cartel took years to enter the market.

Companies had to find the oil and develop the discoveries.

In unconventional plays, producers know where the hydrocarbons are.

They can bring oil and gas online as quickly as it takes to drill and complete wells in shale or drill and steam a well pair at an established oil sands project.

To the limited extent cartels ever work, they do so when producers outside the cartel operate at near-term capacity rates.

Thanks to unconventional resources, that condition no longer applies. The change represents a new and potentially fatal challenge to OPEC's ability to manage supply.

Quick-draw supply definitely exists outside the supply-management mechanism.

Drilling in several US tight oil plays rebounded quickly in response to oil-price strengthening late last year.

Consequent output combined with projects starting up in the Gulf of Mexico to arrest a US crude-oil production decline that began in May of 2015 and reached bottom last September.

How high the production recovery goes remains an important question with no ready answer.

We're in new territory with unconventional resources. So far, most surprises have been on the high side.

Last month, the Energy Information Administration projected US crude production increases of 300,000 barrels a day this year and 500,000 barrels a day in 2018—from tight oil and offshore projects for which development started before 2014. After 2020, tight oil probably will become the only growth category for US production.

Another important question with no easy answer is how OPEC and its partners in supply management respond to price-induced assaults on their market shares—from the United States and elsewhere.

Early indications of quota discipline were encouraging.

Last month the International Energy Agency estimated OPEC compliance

in January and February at 98%. It said Russia and the other non-OPEC collaborators had made 37% of their promised cuts, although those numbers are murkier.

But OPEC's rosy compliance figure depended disproportionately on Saudi Arabia, which made 135% of its promised cut.

Then, stubbornly high oil inventories in the United States provided a reminder that balance won't come easily.

When Saudi officials hinted that their patience with quota cheating had limits, tremors went through the market. Oil prices fell.

Perhaps belatedly, the market has come to realize that success of OPEC's latest exercise in production restraint is far from certain.

A market craving supply management might not get what it wants.

What then?

If the production agreements unravel, or if—as is possible—they survive only in press notices from the OPEC Secretariat, crude prices will fall again.

Market psychology, you know.

This is the storm cloud ever above an industry with more near-term capacity to produce oil than is needed—and with much of that capacity newly exempt from coordinated management.

This is the new world of unconventional resources.

At the cost margin of this new, reactive world, producers face the risk that any new production they contemplate in response to price gains might aggravate surplus, weaken prices, and undermine their investments.

And if OPEC and its collaborators cannot manage supply effectively enough to stabilize the crude price, producers everywhere will have to become comfortable working in a market left to its own devices.

An industry able to produce oil and gas from source rock should be able to handle this.

Operators have new analytical tools with which to assess local markets and competition—tools to advise them when to bring new production onstream and when to exercise the option to wait.

And in the industry slump, a lot of shale acreage passed from myriad independent producers under severe financial stress to comparatively fewer integrated companies.

Much eminently manageable shale production has become part of oil-production holdings much larger and more-diversified than those of the independents who pioneered shale development.

Big companies will bring different management to those assets.

To use Wall Street terminology, I expect them to use their acquisitions to enhance optionality of their upstream portfolios.

Shale production will become swing production for ExxonMobil, Chevron, Marathon Oil, and other integrated companies able to achieve the scale they need in shale plays.

Then the oil-producing world begins to look different.

OPEC might continue trying to manage its supply through collaboration. Russia might help; it might even become a member.

But OPEC's only enforcement mechanism remains Saudi Arabia's idle production capacity and Riyadh's threat to use it to keep other cartel members in line.

Outside OPEC, in the world I'm imagining, production management increasingly comes from market-based decisions of large companies controlling enough rapid-response production in shale and other resource plays to meaningfully influence global supply.

Those companies cannot collaborate, of course—with OPEC or among themselves.

But they have something OPEC lacks: effective enforcement. That's new.

If I'm right about this, or nearly so, a market that craves supply management will have to trust a new dimension of the enterprise.

It will be supply management that depends less than before on collaboration and quotas many authorities no longer will impose.

It will be supply management increasingly deriving from decisions big producers make on the basis of their investments and expectations about oil-market fundamentals.

The oil market, in other words, will learn to trust genuine market forces.

Fancy that.

The mechanism I'm speculating about here won't work with engineering precision.

Markets never do.

OPEC's management of supply over the past four decades has been contentious, disorderly, even makeshift.

Yet the market depended on it—and collapsed when OPEC took its vacation from the project in 2014.

The paradox is as savory as bread, butter, bacon, and beans: A market that craves management resists management—even at gunpoint.

Our hero Alfalfa Bill Murray never hit his buck-a-barrel target. He declared martial law in Oklahoma's oil fields three times, and the crude price stayed below 70 cents a barrel.

Another failure?

Well, Oklahoma did become an important oil-producing state, with an exciting resurgence now in the SCOOP and STACK plays.

The oil price is—well, better than the inflation-adjusted equivalent of 70 pennies a barrel.

And nobody, I hope, has forgotten Alfalfa Bill Murray.

Thank you.

WINNER: GOVERNMENT

"Seat Belts, State Budgets and the Art of Compromise"

By John Patterson for John Cullerton,
Illinois Senate President



Delivered at the City Club of Chicago, July 6, 2017

Good morning. Thank you for the opportunity to be here. I always look forward to talking to this group.

I'm pleased to finally have something to talk about in regards to our budget.

But, before I put everyone to sleep with a long discussion of budget numbers, I want to begin with some audience participation.

If you drove here this morning or have driven anywhere recently, raise your hand if you wore your seatbelt.

Go ahead. Hold those hands up high, I need to be able to see them to count.

Good. It looks like just about everyone did.

Ok, if we were suddenly transported back to the 1980's, you would have seen much different results. Only about 15 percent of you would have raised your hands.

Buckling up was not routine.

I know this because I sponsored the law that first required seatbelt use in Illinois.

And let me tell you, that wasn't an easy task.

I was trying to get people to vote for something that told 85 percent of their constituents to change their daily behavior.

That kind of change isn't easy.

In my experience, here's how you do it:

You begin with a small step forward.

And then, when the world doesn't end, you recognize success, build your base of supporters and keep stepping forward to accomplish your broader goals.

Looking back, that initial seatbelt law seems watered-down by what we are all accustomed to today. A cop couldn't even stop you for not wearing your seatbelt.

But it worked to move the ball forward.

Today, nearly 90 percent (88.8 percent) of Illinois adults say they always use a seatbelt when driving or riding in a vehicle.

Illinois was recently ranked the top state in the nation for road safety by the National Safety Council, in part because of our seatbelt laws and widespread use.

My point in telling this story is to emphasize the role of compromise and negotiation in bringing about change and moving issues forward.

Look, I could have stomped my feet back in the 1980's and demanded mandatory seatbelt enforcement for the front and back seat or i would never vote for a state budget or anything else.

I can tell you what would have happened: nothing.

Obviously, the governor of Illinois has more influence and should be able to get things done faster than some rank-and-file lawmaker.

But governors aren't dictators.

They need to be able to negotiate and compromise, too.

Ok, so that brings me to the bipartisan balanced budget the Senate just approved and backed up with an override of the governor's veto, a budget that hopefully the House will be enacting as law later today with a similar override.

Let's go ahead and get one thing out of the way.

Yes. There's a tax increase in it. Or as i like to call it, a partial reinstatement of the previous tax rates.

The personal income tax goes to 4.95 percent from 3.75 percent.

That's a 1.2 percentage point increase if you voted for it, it's Mike Madigan's permanent 32 percent tax increase if you're Governor Rauner.

Remember, the tax rate was 5 percent from 2011 to 2015. This is lower.

It's also lower than just about every state around us, nearly all of which have graduated tax brackets.

I'm pretty sure I'm safe in saying that everyone in this room would be paying rates well in excess of 4.95 percent.

Someone making \$50,000 pays a 6.27 percent income tax rate in Wisconsin. In Iowa, that person pays 7.92 percent.

But, there's a lot more than a tax rate to our balanced budget.

I don't usually write press releases for Bruce Rauner, but let me offer up a couple possible headlines of what he could be doing and saying rather than vetoing balanced budgets:

— Budget deal cuts state spending by \$3 billion—Rauner works democrats for biggest budget cut in recent history.

— Rauner-led pension reforms could save taxpayers \$1.5 billion: 401k-style system to get test run.

Those could both be true.

Those are also both examples of how Rauner and the Republicans shaped the budget that is on the verge of finally becoming law.

There are nearly \$3 billion in cuts and savings in this plan. They are there because Republicans brought them to the table and convinced Democrats they were a good idea.

Those cuts don't happen without Republican participation.

Same thing with the pension reforms, which many of you know I've been involved with in recent years.

The governor gets all of the pension reforms that he and the Republicans wanted. In fact, the part that I wanted got taken out. It's now just the Republican part.

But the governor vetoed it.

And then we overrode his veto to make sure the pension changes he wants become law. I voted for it, twice

on Tuesday, even though the part I wanted was removed.

My point is, this budget was shaped—and supported—by Republicans.

It contains win after win for the Rauner administration if it would choose to recognize those wins.

There's all kinds of stuff he could cite as progress that happened only because he is the governor.

I recognize that people are sick and tired of the political finger pointing. I get it. I want results, too.

But I'm left to deal with a governor who filed veto messages that read like campaign attack ad scripts.

And this is a governor who vanished from public view for the better part of the last two weeks, just as he has every May when a budget deadline approaches.

Whenever it's crunch time, he disappears only to emerge after the deadline with a new set of campaign ads attacking Democrats.

That means he spends those crucial times working on attack ads rather than doing his job.

Given his recent disappearance, I expect a new round of ads to start tonight if they haven't already.

Now, I get off easy in this from a political perspective.

99 percent of those ads aren't directed at me. They're directed at Mike Madigan.

And I'm not here to be a Madigan apologist.

Trust me, the Speaker can sometimes be difficult to work with.

But the governor has only made the situation worse.

Look at it this way, if I spent \$10 million calling the City Club a bunch of crooks, I think our relationship would suffer. You would probably stop asking me to come speak here.

What's really troublesome is that I know the governor has the ability to compromise. I know he can see the big picture.

We all saw it just a couple weeks ago when he signed an anti-gun violence law that Republicans and Democrats put together.

Here's part of what Governor Rauner said in signing the law:

"This was not easy legislation to pass. This took a lot of work for many months by many people. Many compromises, many new ideas needed to be discussed and debated.

It shows what we can do when we put our minds to it and decide to work together to solve problems and take a step forward.

This is not an answer. This is a step in the right direction."

That's Governor Rauner speaking. I couldn't agree with him more.

That wasn't easy legislation. There were Senate Democrats who felt the final product was watered down. We probably had the votes to try to jam additional provisions down the governor's throat.

But we didn't do that.

We didn't do that because we recognized the importance of coming together on this issue.

And to the governor's credit, he too wanted to be part of addressing the issue of gun violence. And he wanted to do it in a bipartisan fashion.

What I don't understand is why the governor doesn't see the same opportunities in the budget proposals.

There are cuts and reforms and changes that he could and should take credit for.

But he won't.

It's really frustrating.

We essentially wasted 2 1/2 years fighting over the state budget only to now be on the verge of the general assembly taking control of the situation and forcing a budget on the state because the governor will not engage.

There's a cost that comes with that delay, and it's not just the threat of "junk" status from Wall Street.

We've missed out on billions of dollars in revenue that could have paid our bills. Instead, they got dumped onto the pile of iou's and are racking up interest.

We could have prevented the Medicaid lawsuit.

We could have kept the Wells Center in Jacksonville, Illinois open to provide

rehab services to an area in the midst of a heroin epidemic.

The list of victims goes on and on.

I have my regrets in all of this.

In retrospect, I should have forced action sooner.

When Republican Leader Christine Radogno and I unveiled the Senate's Grand Bargain in early January, our hope was to spur quick, bipartisan action.

Leader Radogno, now former Leader Radogno, will never get the credit she deserves for her work behind the scenes to push us to a budget. The Senate's grand bargain effort was her idea. She came to me and said: let's see if we can do this.

She stood up to the well-funded right wing of the Republican Party and openly talked about the need to raise the tax rate to balance the budget.

If it wasn't for her, there never would have been the leaders meetings that led to the House vote for the balanced budget.

As I said, it's a budget that has been shaped by input from Republicans. It would look a lot different if it had been Democrats only.

If the House can again muster the votes for an override later today, this specific budget crisis will finally be over, but not our need to compromise and work together.

A school funding overhaul still waits to be sent to the governor's desk.

I'd like to think Governor Rauner would see the opportunities it provides to honor his promise to change our worst-in-the-nation system.

Despite all the political rhetoric and theatrics, I remain optimistic that he will get to the place where he signs it. I believe he does want to improve education.

I'm optimistic because I heard what the governor said in signing the anti-gun violence law. I know that he can see the opportunities for progress when he chooses to.

And I'm also optimistic because I'm pretty sure the governor wears his seatbelt.

Thank you again for the invitation to speak here this morning.

WINNER: INSURANCE

"The New Normal for Insurers and Brokers"

By Lorne Christensen for David Fried, CEO,
Emerging Markets, QBE Insurance

Delivered in Singapore, March 6, 2017

At industry events like this, discussions tend to naturally turn to what lies ahead.

And while many people speculate about what tomorrow might look like, I can honestly say that I have already seen our future.

Twice.

The first time was a number of years ago. Back when I was still in the bancassurance side of the business.

A banking colleague showed me a video of a group of designers attempting to work in a kitchen at GE's consumer appliance headquarters in Louisville, Kentucky.

I say 'attempting' because in the video the GE designers had their knuckles and fingers wrapped in athletic tape. Some also had cotton balls stuffed in their ears. Others were wearing special glasses that obscured their vision. And several had even put handfuls of popcorn kernels inside their shoes.

The apparent point of all this was to simulate what it feels like to be old. Everything from the arthritis to the hearing loss to the reduced vision to the aches and pains from just walking around.

The goal of this particular exercise was to help the young designers understand what older people go through, so these designers could in turn create better appliances for a growing population of ageing consumers.

My second glimpse into the future was a number of months ago.

It was in New York, where I had the opportunity to spend some time inside Google's corporate engineering office. The technology company's largest office outside their global headquarters in Silicon Valley.

This is the place where the Googlers—which is what they like to call themselves—build the systems that

keep the search engine running that enable all of us to access the information that we want at anytime and almost anywhere.

Now, if you look beyond Google's leading-edge workplace environment. Beyond the people zipping around on scooters. Beyond the digital bookshelves. Even beyond things like the full-sized food truck that was parked inside the building, handing out free desserts.

If you look beyond all of this, one of the most striking things about Google's NYC office is the very singular focus of the people working there. In particular, the optimism of Googlers regarding their ability to use technology and information to "change people's lives for the better"

I share with you what I saw in the GE video several years ago and during my Google visit several months ago, because I want to draw a direct parallel to where I see our industry going for both insurers and brokers.

As we all know, the insurance business is in the midst of a massive shift, with advancements in technology potentially challenging the very sustainability of what we do.

Some describe our industry as facing a "once-in-a-generation disruption" due to everything from advanced analytics to regulatory changes. Others are even more apocalyptic, predicting that our industry will be "wiped out" if we don't soon "digitally awaken".

Specific to brokers, there are also those who wonder whether your role as a link between customers and insurers can actually survive the digital age. After all, they note, one of the common traits of successful disrupters like Uber and Airbnb is the fact that they completely eliminated the middleman.

Predictions about long-term survival aside for the moment, the near-term

monetary implications are certainly sobering for us all.

Indeed, Oliver Wyman has forecast that globally, the financial and insurance sectors could collectively lose upwards of US\$150 billion in revenue to technology start-ups by 2025.

And while start-ups will most certainly take business away from insurers and from brokers, another obvious threat to us both is the large, non-traditional, tech-based, internet-savvy competitors such as the aforementioned Google. Also Amazon. And of course Alibaba, which is already disrupting the Chinese insurance market.

The reality is that some insurers and some brokers will undoubtedly not survive this 'new normal' climate because they will be unable to compete. Or they will make a key strategic blunder—something I will come back to later.

That all said—and to paraphrase Mark Twain—I personally believe that predictions about our industry's looming demise at the hands of technology companies are greatly exaggerated.

In fact, I think that as an industry, we need to be looking at this 'new normal' for what it really is: the latest in new opportunities.

For the purposes of my talk today, I want to draw your attention to three opportunities specific to brokers and insurers here in Asia Pacific.

The first opportunity is to overcome at least some of our industry's image issues.

There is actually a research paper out of INSEAD that makes some interesting observations about such issues amidst what they call "the relentless advance of technological progress." This paper notes that "at first sight" the insurance sector should in theory enjoy a positive reputation because of

all our “contributions to society.” Contributions that include everything from providing protection and compensation to risk analysis and risk reduction.

The authors of this paper go on to point out that “on closer inspection” however the image of the insurance industry is not good, with public perceptions about our industry “blurred.”

Blurred because of past scandals involving some insurers.

Blurred because of the perceived opacity of our business.

Blurred because of problems related to misrepresentation.

Blurred because of customers’ privacy concerns.

Blurred because of various levels of customer dissatisfaction.

I find such observations interesting for a couple of reasons.

First, I think the authors of this report were being charitable in their conclusion that the image of our industry was “not so good.”

As a former school teacher used to tell a class I was in: ‘pretty good’ actually means ‘pretty bad’.

The other reason I highlight this particular research paper is because it reinforces that not much has really changed.

In fact, this particular paper is anything but new. It was actually written and published more than 10 years ago. And if we pause, to look around now more than a decade later, we are still in the midst of that aforementioned relentless advance of technology.

Clearly, we as an industry are also still suffering from image issues.

Indeed, the other day I was reading a report in which one observer noted that even when the process of purchasing insurance online is made easy and seamless, customers often still end up very confused. By the length of a typical policy they then receive. By the legal language within that policy. By the long lists of what is and is not covered.

What is also clear, is that we as an industry have an opportunity to use technology to change such perceptions.

Of course, our success will depend largely on our ability to take new-

found efficiencies beyond just the transactional element. In other words, while things like access, speed and convenience are critically important, such won’t matter much if customers don’t understand what we provide. Nor if we, from the customer’s perspective, don’t take care of them throughout the entire interactional cycle.

In short, we have to be seen delivering value from the customers’ points of view, rather than just doing what WE think constitutes good service.

Ultimately, it is the customer’s definition of service that matters, not ours. And their definition may include a constantly changing combination of things from having the best price to offering highly tailored insurance cover to providing convenience to sharing our professional risk expertise to efficiently handling a claim to being seen as a valued partner rather than someone who pushes off products.

All of which brings me to the second opportunity that we have: namely, the opportunity for insurers and brokers to leverage new technology to increase insurance penetration in the Asia Pacific.

The space to expand is certainly there...

Non-life penetration levels in the Asia Pacific remain very low in many countries and the region as a whole is well behind more developed markets. Specific to disaster-related insurance, Asia also has the dubious distinction of being home to five of the top 10 markets with the largest uninsured losses globally.

The foundation for growth is also there.

The combination of continued economic expansion across this region, rising incomes and increasing urbanisation as well as the need for infrastructure development provides an ideal foundation. And we are seeing evidence of such with overall premium growth in Asia Pacific forecast to be more than 9% in 2017 alone.

The potential is very much there.

Here in Singapore, for example, our research suggests that more than

50% of SMEs are currently content to operate with only the most basic level of insurance. Even more concerning, however, is the fact that one in 10 of the smaller SMEs we surveyed admitted to not carrying any insurance cover whatsoever.

And the tech capability and acceptability is also already there.

In fact, one of the attractive aspects of markets in this region for both insurers and brokers, is the high usage of mobile devices. It is estimated that around two thirds of people in Asia Pacific already subscribe to mobile services and 600 million more new subscribers are expected to sign up by 2020.

As a result, an increasingly large number people in the region will become more and more comfortable interacting via their phones. Checking prices. Comparing products. Consulting others. Completing transactions.

As such, it is very possible for our industry to leap-frog into higher percentages of digital delivery of insurance products than more mature markets.

Of course, against this backdrop, one important success factor will be the continued alignment of the strategies of insurers and brokers.

In the past, you have played a vitally important role in growing the insurance market in Asia Pacific. Just a couple of years ago intermediaries were said to hold 60% of all insurance contracts in the region.

As for the future, I agree with those who believe that brokers can continue to play a very important role as trusted advisors who help customers navigate an increasingly complex set of insurance choices.

And as others have pointed out, the greatest potential for our relationship lies in mutually beneficial innovation.

This includes using new technology to tighten the relationship between brokers and insurers to be able to serve customers anytime and anywhere. It also includes using technology to improve the interactions between insurers and brokers to enhance productivity. Also, brokers and insurers sharing more

data to gain greater insights into evolving customer trends.

Ultimately, new technology will enable brokers and insurers to work together to build even closer partnerships with each other and with customers.

Just as aside, incorporating new technology into our interactions with customers also means learning one other critical lesson from the tech industry. Namely, the importance of simplicity when designing customer touch points.

In fact, one of those Googlers I mentioned earlier advocates that all new online interfaces with customers—like apps for example—should be able to pass what he calls the “young, old or drunk” test.

In other words, just how easy is it for these ‘different groups’ of users to use your new offering. Apparently, inebriated individuals are great test subjects because they are easily distracted and easily discouraged if they encounter technology challenges.

Back to my list of opportunities for brokers and insurers. The third opportunity is the ability to leverage advancing technology to both better understand our customers and to better serve their needs.

Obviously, in the area of data and analytics, as technology evolves, so should our industry’s ability to manage risk. That’s a given. However, the same cannot be said about technology automatically translating into a better customer experience.

Now, it is quite common today to hear people in and around our industry excitedly talking about technology as if it was the ‘be’ all.

The end all.

The only all.

There are those who want to harness technology and are investing millions in an attempt to do so. Last month, Willis Towers Watson estimated that around half of all insurers globally will acquire digital assets in the next three years.

The reality is that technology in general and e-platforms in particular will provide us with the capability to re-

define our service approach. However, the other reality we need all to remember is that technology is a channel to and for serving customers. An important service channel obviously.

But ultimately, we are not tech companies. And this is where the potential strategic blunder I referred to earlier lurks...

In the midst of the continued hype around the latest technologies and the erosion of some business to niche providers, some insurance companies will undoubtedly panic and try to become tech companies.

This very question came up at an ‘Insurance Disrupted’ conference in California a little over a year ago.

As one observer at the time noted: companies were essentially being asked whether they will be insurers who leverage technology? Or whether they will reframe themselves as technology companies who happen to sell insurance?

Now, for the record—let me just state up front—QBE is not about to try to become a tech company. Rather we will continue to be an insurer to our clients and customers.

That said, we are most certainly also continuing to embrace new technologies in order to be both a better manager and better mitigator of risk. QBE has a Data and Analytics hub based out of Manila and Bangalore. From there, we are using data and analytics to do everything from improving customer retention to strengthening underwriting to reducing claims fraud.

Also for the record, the QBE Group also has its own technology lab.

It’s located in the city of Sun Prairie, a suburb of Madison, Wisconsin, and serves our operations here in Asia Pacific as well as elsewhere. At our Global Innovation Lab, we conduct experiments with advanced technologies that will help QBE grow and improve efficiency and serve our customers more effectively around the world.

For example, the Lab has done some work with drone technology. And now, we use drones to enhance the efficiency of our claims process. Last April, when

Ecuador was hit by a 7.8-magnitude earthquake, we were able to gain rapid visual access to even the worst affected areas using drones. This allowed us to quickly determine the extent of the damage. This also enabled us to pay out 90% of the large claims from this CAT in less than 90 days.

On that note, let me conclude by talking about how you as brokers and we as insurers can together grasp this huge opportunity otherwise known as the Asia Pacific.

From my perspective, ‘the how’ comes down to four key things:

First, as I said earlier, it comes down to us collaborating with each other even more. On our digital strategies. In terms of the sharing information about customers. And also how we use technology to serve customers anytime and anywhere.

It comes down to collaborating more to persuade customers that insurance cover is something that is not a nice to have, but rather a must-have. It comes down to working together to change perceptions—one customer at a time if necessary.

The second key is in ensuring simplicity in our existing and new digital touch points. I cited the ‘young, old or drunk’ test advocated by some in the tech business.

Another example of superb simplicity is WhatsApp. While some have called it the “ugliest messaging app out there”, WhatsApp has quite purposely not tried to do too much. Instead they are concentrating on just delivering a high-quality messaging experience. They also have more than a billion users.

For brokers and insurers, also keeping it simple will be absolutely vital when it comes to increasing insurance penetration in Asia Pacific via digital channels.

The third key goes back to the GE video I described at the outset. The one with the GE designers wearing darkened glasses, with their knuckles taped up and cotton balls sticking out of their ears, limping around a test kitchen.

I highlighted this particular example because that is precisely the same

kind of customer focus that we as an industry need to return to in order to be successful.

In other words, for us the ‘new normal’ is in reality a return to the new old normal. A return to a time when our products and services were developed primarily from a customer’s perspective.

Finally, and most importantly, for brokers and insurers to be successful in an age of digital disruption, we need to remember that technology must continue to be just a ‘means to an end’ rather than ‘the end’ in itself.

Indeed, even a large tech company like Google recognises that their success is not about having the latest or

the newest or the trendiest technology. Instead it is all about identifying ways—again in their words—to “change peoples’ lives for the better” and “delight them in the process”.

Simply put, you and I—as brokers and insurers—need to be thinking the very same way as these Googlers.

WINNER: MEDIA

“Storytelling at National Geographic in the Digital Age”

By Jack Dougherty for Susan Goldberg, Editorial Director, National Geographic Partners and Editor in Chief of *National Geographic Magazine*

Delivered to Rhodes Scholars at Oxford University, Oxford, England, March 7, 2017

I grew up in Ann Arbor, a city in Michigan.

When I was a little girl, my parents used to load my sister and me into the car on weekends and we’d drive to my grandparents’ house—near Detroit.

My grandparents were immigrants from Russia and Poland. They spoke broken, heavily-accented English—with a lot of Yiddish sprinkled in.

My grandfather was a pugnacious, up-by-the-bootstraps businessman who didn’t get past fifth grade. But whatever he may have lacked in education, he made up for in certainty.

He won every argument, big or small, by trotting out what he called the “Actual Facts”—usually at top volume.

After each visit, on the drive back to Ann Arbor, my sister and I would sit in the backseat and giggle about my grandfather and his “Actual Facts.” A ridiculous, redundant phrase we saw as proof of his lack of erudition.

We knew facts were facts. Period.

Which is why I can’t tell you how astounding it is to me that today—50 years later—the United States and a lot of the rest of the world is talking about “Actual Facts.”

To say nothing of “alternative facts” and their equally scurrilous cousins: “fake news” and “post-truth.”

When my grandfather distorted the truth, it was annoying, but it didn’t really matter: the stakes were low.

After all, he sold cheap furniture for a living. It wasn’t as though he was in a position to steer the global economy ... or declare war on another country ... or on the First Amendment.

But now, when our elected leaders do the same thing, it’s frightening.

What’s even scarier is the audacity of lies. The volume of lies. And the ability of lies to proliferate instantly, globally, across multiple channels.

Here’s another thing that’s new: Today a lot of people—in fact, millions of people—willfully and in some cases enthusiastically embrace the alternative reality being sold.

This is the bad news.

But there’s also good news.

Millions more people aren’t buying it. We’re aware of what’s happening. We’re not allowing ourselves to be lulled into complacency.

Not most of the public. And most certainly not the mainstream press, which recently found itself labeled as “the enemy” of the American people and “a great danger to our country” by ... the President of the United States.

More than any time I can remember, people who care about the truth, who care about facts, are fired up and fighting back. We’re exposing the lies. We’re confronting the peddlers of “alternative facts.”

The same internet that makes it possible to spread disinformation at

lightning speed also makes it possible for fact-checkers to unmask it in real time.

Still ... too many of the lies stick. And they stick not only with the zealots and true believers, but with seemingly reasonable people, too.

When I started my career in newspapers, 37 years ago, we used to say, “Find the truth and print it.” That made sense, then and now. But the hard lesson we’ve learned lately is: Just because the truth is on your side doesn’t mean the truth will prevail.

I’m not suggesting that we stop fact-checking and stop confronting truth-twisters. What I am saying is that if we expect the truth to win the day at a time when, to quote George Orwell—“The very concept of objective truth is fading out of the world”—we may need to formulate new strategies for these surreal times.

Which brings me to the question I want to explore today: How are we going to do that?

In my case, how are my colleagues and I at National Geographic going to open people’s minds to the realities of climate change, to pick just one example, at a time when minds are clamping shut?

How do we do this within the context of a 129-year old magazine and across other print and digital content platforms that reach 171 countries in 45 languages?

How do we make stories that are on the side of science, on the side of facts, and on the side of the planet, sticky in slippery times?

And the same question I'm putting to myself, I put to you:

What will you do when you leave here and launch a career in public service ... or the academy ... or the sciences, to advance the cause of objective truth?

Orwell's message is dystopian, but mine is not. I'm an optimist. I think we can fix this.

But it's going to require us to think and behave differently. And it's going to be hard work.

To turn things around, we've got to hit reverse on two problematic trends.

First, it's tempting to write off the people who reject objective truth—but we can't do that. We can't just cut these people loose. The stakes are too high—as we learned in 2016. Instead, we have to figure out how to bring them back into a place that's grounded in—yes—the Actual Facts.

Second, we need to remember the ties that bind us to each other. Around the world too many people in senior economic, political, cultural and media jobs have become disconnected from other people.

You can call these people “thought leaders” ... or the “expert class” ... or “elites.”

Whatever we call them, the backlash against this global leadership class has been fierce—as we just saw here in the UK with Brexit, and in the U.S. with the Trump victory.

Our leadership class needs to turn outward, not inward. And that needs to happen fast. We've got to break out of our bubbles and engage with people from all backgrounds, beliefs and social classes.

Let's talk about each of these trends in more detail.

We'll start with facts.

Ah, facts.

As you know, facts, evidence and the

scientific method are under assault as never before.

This trend has me scratching my head.

Four hundred years ago, Galileo argued that the earth and planets revolve around the sun. His scientific theories—which turned out to be true—got him into big trouble with the Vatican. He was put on trial and branded a heretic.

Supposedly, we've come a long way since then.

Yet here we are in 2017 and scientific knowledge is under furious attack—from evolution ... to climate change ... to the safety of vaccines and GMOs. Some people even think fluoridating water was a communist plot, and that the moon landing was faked!

Today we have access to irrefutable evidence and data—all of it double- and triple-checked and verified. Yet the facts are questioned by millions of people “empowered by their own sources of information, and their own interpretations of research.”

We're now living in a time when “doubters have declared war on the consensus of experts.”

I didn't write that last sentence. It came from a cover story we did a few years ago in National Geographic Magazine called “The War on Science.”

So how did we get here? Four hundred years after Galileo's trial, how did scientific evidence get into a head-on collision with un-scientific opinion?

A couple of factors are at play.

First, the trust gap between the public and experts that has been widening over the past several decades has now cracked wide open. And as the “certified” experts decline in stature ... the “self-declared” experts ascend.

Today, thanks to social media and a polarized media landscape—there is an equal counterpoint to every point, no matter how fantastical.

For every scientist who vehemently argues the world is round, there is a polemicist who vehemently counter-argues the world is flat.

Today, if an amateur's opinion is advanced with what the American

author and journalist Jonathan Rauch calls “sufficient emotional vehemence,” that opinion is given the same weight as facts.

We in the media have played a role in this. For too long, in the name of “balance,” we gave equal weight to both sides of an argument—even if weren't really two credible sides.

We are getting better about not falling into these “false equivalency” traps. But it's slow going.

We're also in data's thrall. We've adopted a technocratic mindset that says, “If the facts are unassailable, the solutions should be self-evident—and you all need to get on board!”

Well, they may be self-evident to some, but they are not self-evident to all.

Which is why we're in the place we're in with global warming. We believed—wrongly—that logic and reason alone would prevail.

We became so focused on facts, stats and numbers that we forgot a fundamental truth about what makes people tick: Most people understand the world through history and context—not cold facts and stats. Most people absorb what they come to see as true through narratives accumulated over a lifetime, through stories that convey meaning and impact.

We are, and always have been, storytellers.

Today, scientists are spending a lot more time trying to understand how humans process information and reach conclusions—and it's not a minute too soon.

One scientist—Dan Kahan at Yale—is looking at how “believing” in climate change has become an entrenched part of people's sense of self.

That means you can bombard a person with as many facts as you want in an effort to change their mind, he says, but the person will reject the facts because they threaten his or her sense of self-identity.

The solution, says Professor Kahan, is to make the facts palatable—to customize them and present them in such a way to appeal to the audience's ideological taste buds.

In short, he's trying to crack the code on how to present information in ways that makes people—especially skeptical people—feel safe. Not assaulted.

We're discovering that content isn't enough; you've got to provide context. Which is exactly what we're trying to do at National Geographic Magazine.

Let me tell you about our exploration into one of the most complex, divisive issues today: Gender.

Two months ago, we published an issue devoted to looking at gender roles around the world, including people who are transgender or otherwise reject the gender binary.

When this topic is examined through a political lens—from either direction, which it usually is—the coverage is utterly predictable and utterly polarizing.

Instead, we approached this topic as cultural explorers, scientists and visual storytellers who sought to look at how gender roles—all of them—were playing out around the world.

We sought to educate. We refused to shout, "These are the facts, people. Get on board or get lost!"

Instead, we said: You've been hearing about this gender spectrum for the last few years. You're probably confused about it. (We certainly were.) Let's put our biases aside, take a deep breath, and examine this topic in the hopes of gaining deeper understanding.

We used our tools as storytellers who seek to explain cultures, science and history. Why? We have a diverse readership. Our magazine goes to urban liberals ... conservative rural folks ... and people from various religious and ethnic cultures around the world.

We provided a discussion guide to help families and schools discuss gender. We literally included a glossary to give them the words.

We knew the issue would upset a number of readers. And it did: More than 7,000 people canceled their subscriptions—many of them returning the magazine directly to me, unopened and still in the polybag. I wish I could have convinced them just to open it. Even for a second.

But you should have seen the letters I got from others. People who said our issue had given their families "permission" to talk about things they had never been able to talk about before.

The most striking thing was the reach of the gender issue outside of the magazine. More than 370 million people engaged with us on our social media platforms around our gender content. And on those platforms, more than 90 percent of the feedback was positive or neutral.

We succeeded with the gender issue because nobody ever won an argument by opening with, "Listen, stupid!"

It takes longer to figure out how to convey facts in a way that can make them palatable to those disinclined to believe them, but you must do this to open people's minds.

That's my job.

When I came to the magazine three years ago, I laid down some "Editorial Commandments" to my team:

I said we need to publish stories that matter, stories that will make a difference in people's lives. They needed to be stories that made sense for the National Geographic to do. Stories that showcased our unique visual and storytelling capabilities and global reach.

I also told my team that I expected our magazine to act more urgently, to plug into the conversations that are happening now—or even better, start new conversations. To get people talking.

I think we accomplished all of that with the Gender issue. I brought each of you a copy of the magazine today.

I'd be honored if all of you would read it and let me know if you agree ... or tell me what you think we could have done differently.

* * *

Let's talk more about you.

The people in this room are lucky. Individually, each of you Rhodes Scholars is always the smartest person in the room.

There was a time when people with advanced skills sets, professional

pedigrees—thought leaders—were universally admired.

That's not always the case today.

If you want proof, compare the news coverage of the World Economic Forum in Davos a decade ago—totally fawning—to the meeting that was just held in January.

This year, the so-called "global elite" were not portrayed in a very favorable light after being caught flat-footed by the biggest global story in years: The rise of populism.

What changed?

One thing that changed is that too many of our thought leaders started living inside gilded bubbles—surrounded almost exclusively by people like them.

Some—not, all, but some—lost empathy for the people whose aren't as cosmopolitan, who aren't in their world.

Many of our fellow countrymen and —women began to feel patronized ... or invisible.

And last year, their grievances—which had been simmering for years—boiled over. A huge cohort of people in the UK and the US rose up and rebelled against the elites.

This didn't just come out of left field in 2016. The resentments built up over years.

The Trump administration and Brexit arrived like that character in *The Sun Also Rises* who went broke: gradually, then suddenly.

We've got to fix this.

Here's the thing I urge everyone here today to remember:

Being the smartest one in the room shouldn't be an end in itself, it's just the beginning.

The privilege you enjoy as the result of the attributes that brought you here is obvious.

Your responsibility—if you don't mind my saying—is to make sure you remember that most people don't enjoy your advantages ... and they deserve your attention and respect.

I hope none of you will ever end up coming across like a college student who emailed me a few weeks ago to pitch a story for the National Geographic.

The aspiring journalist who wrote me was 19—a student at Washington University, in St. Louis, Missouri. A great school.

The young man who wrote me described himself as—quote—“a liberal Jewish kid from the Boston suburbs.”

In his email pitch, he explained that he believed America’s current divisions are the result of “gross misunderstandings” between our citizens. People live in entirely different contexts and they don’t understand each other, he said.

I couldn’t have agreed with him more.

He then went on to say, “I’m as baffled as everyone else” about who these Trump voters are. “I really do want to try to understand why these people think and act the way they do.”

Okay, I thought: Let’s see what he’s going to propose.

Instead of going to Florida for spring break 2017, this aspiring journalist offered instead to embed himself in an Evangelical Christian community in what he called “the Heartland.”

He would conduct a one-week study on our behalf and then submit an article that would explain these exotic creatures to what he called “the folks back home.”

It was as though he intended to observe the Evangelicals as if they were ... cheetahs in a zoo ... instead of his fellow countrymen and -women.

I wrote him back and told him we’d pass on his story.

“I’m from the Midwest—the ‘heartland,’ as you call it,” I said in my reply. “Lots of people are. We aren’t all Evangelical Christians or out-of-work factory employees or right wingers or simpletons or any other one thing.

“Maybe the way to understand the community—if you really want to—is to take advantage of the fact that you actually are living in St. Louis.

“You don’t need to spend spring break observing; you can actually live it—provided you leave the confines of school and get to know people in the neighborhoods that surround that privileged enclave. That, I think,

will lead to a deeper understanding.” That’s what I told him.

I know what some of you are thinking: “Wow, she was hard on him! The kid’s only 19!”

Yes, I guess I was. But I felt I had to be.

If he wants to join my profession, I want him to view his fellow Americans as real people, with real dreams, and real problems—not objects of “anthropological curiosity.”

Because there’s a cost to be paid—as we’ve just witnessed—when the upper class, the middle class, and the working class no longer do business with each other.

We’ve got to fix this. We’ve got to reverse this trend. We’ve got to re-engage with each other.

And the way to do this is to break out of our bubbles.

For me, that means getting more diversity in my newsroom.

Yes, gender and racial diversity. But—equally important—intellectual diversity and social class diversity, too. I’m determined to get smarter about who we’re hiring to ensure we tell true stories.

Let me tell you about one of the best things that happened to me in my career—the thing I believe helped prepare me for the job I have today: My commitment to geographic diversity.

I lived and worked all over the country. Seattle, Washington ... Detroit, Michigan ... San Jose, California ... Cleveland, Ohio. Some of those places are decidedly un-cool.

But I know this: If I’d headed straight to DC at age 21—and stayed there for another three decades—I would have less to offer today.

So here’s my challenge to you: Resist the temptation to live exclusively in “fancy” places.

If you can get a job in New York, DC, Hong Kong, London, by all means take it.

But at some point, consider going someplace less glamorous and more unexpected. Punch your ticket in a second- or even third-tier city or nation—even if it’s just a 2- or 3-year stint.

You’ll be surprised how much it re-engineers your worldview and increases your understanding of the lives other people lead.

* * *

Before I close, I want to impart one final thought.

Our civic discourse today is mean—on the Left and the Right, in the media, in politics, on your Facebook pages, and especially your Twitter feed.

Ironically, at a time when ugliness and incivility have become mainstreamed, more and more people are flocking to us to experience something everybody apparently craves: beauty.

Every day, across all our media platforms, National Geographic serves up a staggering amount of beauty.

I’m not talking about cute pictures of kittens.

Instead, I’m talking about stories and images that provide deep visibility into our planet and its people. Stories and pictures that provide insight. That inspire awe. That show us how our planet and its inhabitants are fragile, occasionally ferocious, resilient, loving, compassionate.

Most of all, these stories demonstrate we have a lot more that unites us than divides us. Which may explain why our reach is soaring.

Almost five years ago, National Geographic established an Instagram account. We turned the account over to our photographers and said, “Here are our guidelines, but this is your baby. Start posting. Set people’s hearts and minds on fire.”

Today we have 80 million followers. Additionally, we have 156 million Facebook friends. 21 million Twitter followers. And are connected with 19 million people on Snapchat. A total of 350 million friends and followers across our social media accounts.

At a time when nearly everybody seems to disagree about everything ... maybe there’s more desire for us to forge connections with each other than we’ve been led to believe.

Which leads me to the moral of my story today.

We must make a compelling case for science and evidence ... but let's do so in ways that respect and accommodate diverse worldviews. Educate, provide context, and patiently explain.

It doesn't matter if the other guys go low. Michelle Obama said this well:

When they go low, we go high.

Resist the temptation to live in bubbles. Instead, try to better understand and empathize with people who aren't like you. And yes, go meet some of them.

This is what my colleagues and I

at the National Geographic are trying to do.

When you all leave Oxford and launch what I'm certain will be brilliant careers, I hope you will consider doing the same.

Thank you.

WINNER: MILITARY

"2017 Outstanding Veterans' Advocate Award"

By Jacqueline Fearer for Will Hatley,
Veterans Vocational Rehabilitation Specialist and
Recipient of the 2017 Outstanding Veterans' Advocate Award



Delivered at Veterans Legal Services
26th Annual Gala, Fairmont Copley Plaza Hotel,
Boston, Sept. 19, 2017

Thank you, Mr. Secretary, and hello everyone. First, I would like to thank Sarah, Anna, Lynn, and all the great staff and volunteers at Veterans Legal Services.

Thanks to tonight's special guests and congratulations to Red Sox President Sam Kennedy and Eastern Bank President Quincy Miller. I am honored to stand on the same stage with these outstanding leaders. And thanks to all of you here tonight at this great event.

I am indeed grateful to receive this award. It began as a dream to assist veterans with open court cases, family, housing, Social Security, and other civil issues that keep our veterans from living their lives fully after serving their country.

Veterans Legal Services started the Legal Clinic at the Bedford VA Hospital on September 29th, 2015. They met with 15 veterans that day.

In the two years since that time, VLS has helped more than 500 veterans!

To all of the attorneys who have given their time to this effort, it is very greatly appreciated. With your support we are transforming lives, empowering these men and women, and breaking the chains that hold them back from success in life.

BELIEVE ME, I HAVE WALKED IN THEIR SHOES.

When I was two years old a tornado blew into my home in Dallas and killed my mother and baby sister. I was left with a fractured skull, a broken leg, a broken arm, and a broken heart.

My grandmother raised me and nursed me back to health. God bless her, but I was angry at God for taking my family from me.

At age 19 I joined the Navy to find my place in the world. But after years on active duty and in the reserves, I lost it again.

I HAD NO ONE TO CATCH ME WHEN I FELL.

At various times I found myself in rehab, in prison, penniless, homeless. Many times I considered suicide.

And then I found help — and hope — at the Bedford VA where I was diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder beginning with the tragic loss of my mother and sister.

This knowledge was the beginning of a new chapter in my life. I began to look in the mirror and forgive myself. And I vowed to help other veterans find the way back to their own place in the world.

I worked hard on my recovery, and one therapist suggested that I express myself through art. Painting "The Patriot", which you can see behind me, took several months to complete, but

during that time it gave me self-esteem, desire, and focus.

And it reminded me of the respect I earned in the military.

So I began training to become certified to work with Operation Iraqi Freedom veterans and Operation Enduring Freedom veterans. I was really proud that the VA gave me this opportunity and trusted me enough to help other veterans. It was a turning point for me. Thank you to all the staff at the VA who supported me. Indeed, many of you are here tonight helping me celebrate this award.

Today I am a vocational rehabilitation specialist at the Bedford VA. I help displaced veterans find jobs by matching their skill sets with prospective employers. I give them follow-along support with conflict resolution, job retention, and social and economic problems.

That's the official job description.

THE MAIN THING I DO IS CATCH THEM WHEN THEY FALL.

Thank you for your time, your kindness, your generosity, and your compassion. God Bless You, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and God Bless America.

WINNER: NONPROFIT

"The State of Civil Discourse"

By David Goodstone and Mark Guarino for John Hewko,
General Secretary, Rotary International



Delivered at Stanford University,
Stanford, California, Oct. 2, 2017

Although this evening's theme is civil discourse, I would like to begin with a different topic—public health.

Public health and civil discourse may seem very distant from one another but they have a distinct and important relationship, where the outcome of the first depends on the nature of the latter. This is perhaps most clearly seen with respect to polio eradication.

Let me explain: As you know, polio is a paralyzing disease that once struck 45,000 people (mostly children) per year in this country and could easily return if not eradicated globally. Fortunately, through the good work of organizations such as Rotary, polio cases have been reduced by an astonishing 99.9 percent since 1988, a year when polio was endemic in 125 countries. The Global Polio Eradication Initiative, supported by Rotary and several other partners including the World Health Organization, UNICEF, the U.S. CDC and Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, is on track to stamp out polio forever from its last bastions in Pakistan, Afghanistan and Nigeria.

Crucial to this historic success story are the creative and thoughtful methods of civic engagement and civil discourse that the polio eradication initiative used to engage tens of thousands of parents in developing countries and convince them of the overwhelming medical evidence that vaccines are safe and effective. These are people who were once wary of the polio vaccine because anti-vaccinator propaganda told them to fear it. They were told all sorts of horrible mistruths, the most widespread being that vaccines were part of a Western plot to sicken or sterilize local children.

Through methods I will discuss later, the initiative won over parents because

it convinced them that conspiracy theories held no value when it came against protecting their children.

Unfortunately, the same cannot be said for our own country where the anti-vaxxer movement presents a serious threat to public health. For example, we are confronted by sad but remarkable data points such as this one: Seattle's polio immunization rate is currently lower than Rwanda, Zimbabwe, and even Iran.

So perhaps it's time that we here in the United States applied the lessons learned from Pakistan, Afghanistan and Nigeria?

Because, in the context of public health at least, the lack of civil discourse and the ability to come to some sort of common understanding on what is right and what is appropriate, can often determine whether children live or whether they die.

Now, civil discourse suggests disagreement. After all, the word "Discourse" comes from the Latin "discursus," meaning "an argument." But it is the modifier "civil" that sets the tone. "Civil" implies that the argument relates to civil life, but is presented with courtesy and respect for the other side. We commonly think of civil discourse as a way to challenge another's viewpoints in an effort to reach a deeper understanding of our own. Of course there will be intense differences, but there also may be recognition of the factors that shaped that person's perspective. If the situation calls for it, there may even be empathy.

In other words, civil discourse is about connecting around ideas, not putting points on the board.

However, we live in a culture that celebrates the winning. It is an argument culture which assumes that opposition should be fierce, loud, and its

arguments irrefutable. There is always the sense that the stakes are high and reputations are to be preserved. The argument culture is not interested in reaching understanding or even consensus. Its primary goal is to dominate the narrative before your adversary does. To do so often requires a toxic mix of hyperbole, high volume, and minimum attention to facts.

This was on full display during the 2016 general election where candidates for the presidency argued and insulted each other throughout a year's worth of televised debates. Discussions of policy took a back seat to attacks, the moderators often lost control, and viewers were treated to discourse that appropriated the energy of a wrestling match.

The news media—and here, I'm referring mostly to the cable news networks—tended to cover the campaign like ringside announcers. Instead of pushing the candidates to unpack their positions on issues such as the environment and healthcare, they focused more on the gamesmanship. In their own attempt to discuss ideas, the networks often either created an echo chamber of like-minded pundits (for example, with respect to any given issue, you can take as an article of faith that Fox News and MSNBC will be on opposite sides) or created panels featuring guests selected from the extreme ends of the political spectrum spending countless hours yelling and talking over each other. With only two or three minutes of airtime, the discussions naturally became superficial and intellectually vacuous fights. Civil discourse didn't have a chance.

Attacks are also common on social media. So while technology has clearly empowered millions in ways never thought imaginable, its anonymity pro-

vides an easy platform for rancorous, outrageous and polarized discourse that previously would have been much more difficult if done in person or in the physical presence of others.

As a result, the majority of states now have laws to crack down on digital harassment such as cyberbullying, Internet trolling and cyberstalking. It's gotten so bad that many news sites have dismantled the comments section underneath stories, because rather than serve their original intention, as venues for thoughtful discourse, the user-generated forums have devolved into online vulgar shouting matches.

And the consequences are not just about hurt feelings. On the one hand, technology makes instant communication a readily available commodity, resulting in a kind of remote intimacy where we can share experiences in real time from anywhere in the world.

Yet, ironically, this same technology is creating social isolation and distance at home, thus, arguably, further contributing to the diminution of civil discourse.

A report published this year in the *American Journal of Preventative Medicine* found that people who spend more than two hours a day on social media were twice as likely to feel socially isolated from other people than those who visited the same sites less frequently—say, a half hour per day or less.

Indeed, for younger people, this social isolation is portending a severe mental health crisis in this country. This fall, a psychology researcher at San Diego University found that teenagers with smartphones are hanging out with their friends less, dating less, and getting less sleep.

What has increased is their loneliness. Loneliness has become such a problem in the U.K. that it is viewed as a serious public health issue deserving of attention by the National Health Service, which is funding programs around the country to draw people away from their screens and toward their community. The problem is so serious that the Campaign to End Loneliness, an advocacy group in Britain,

found that loneliness eclipses obesity as a predictor of early death.

And UCLA Professor Mathew Lieberman has concluded through his research that the lack of social interaction has the same effect on health and longevity as smoking two packs of cigarettes a day.

Technology, it seems, despite its ability to facilitate communication, is actually often making us feel more alone. People are more likely to turn to their smartphone for information than their family, friend or neighbor. They are becoming less prone to hold conversations, let alone civil conversations, in person, possibly because they've lost practice or simply no longer see the need.

So what does all this mean for our body politic?

Well, democracy has always been messy. But what arguably makes today different is the indifference to civil discourse by our leaders. And not just during the most recent election cycle that I mentioned earlier.

Lawmakers who have given into the argument culture—indeed, those who even go so far as to provoke it—have made political dialogue almost impossible. Both sides are so polarized they not only find it hard to reach consensus, they find it even harder to even listen with open minds. Again, the most important currency is the win. Everything else is expendable.

Which brings us back to public health and the need for civil discourse.

The psychology of the anti-vaccination movement is similar to the political polarization we are experiencing today. If someone is convinced of their position—say, that immunizing children for the flu or polio will lead to long-term damage to their health—presenting them with irrefutable evidence to the contrary will not necessarily change their mind, but rather may reinforce their existing views.

A 2014 study published in the journal *Vaccine* showed that even when given material that debunks concerns about the flu vaccine, the majority of people still believed the misperception that the vaccine would give them

the flu. The psychology behind this phenomenon is called “motivated reasoning.”

Here, people will protect their belief system no matter what. When falsehoods tear away at the fabric of their argument, motivated reasoning will jump into action and patch the holes. This is nothing but old-fashioned self-protection where the guiding force is fear.

Motivated reasoning is most active with issues people feel most strongly about—religion, politics, and health, for example. Everyone can agree that evidence supports the argument that stopping at a red light will prevent sudden death, but the polarization starts when people are presented with arguments involving public policies with outcomes they cannot immediately see.

And so fear is a significant part of the problem in the minds of non-vaccinators, or those undecided about whether to immunize their children. Fear drove the measles outbreak to record levels in the U.S. in the past few years. A parent's fear of a vaccine harming a healthy child can cloud all the overwhelming medical evidence that vaccines are safe and effective.

So what do you do when facts aren't enough? When we live in a world of “alternative facts?” When researched analysis and on-the-ground reporting is maligned as “fake news?”

The solution lies in rebuilding the trust and relationships lost by civic disenchantment and social isolation.

Let's return to efforts by the Global Polio Eradication Initiative working to stamp out polio in developing countries. In Pakistan and Nigeria, millions had not received the vaccine and it was soon becoming evident that education without civic engagement was not powerful enough to counter the fear generated by Islamist extremists and widely circulating conspiracy theories. Parents were terrified and their children's health was at serious risk.

To counter this, the GPEI appealed to specialist bodies of Islamic scholars. Through civil discourse the polio eradication effort was able to convince national Islamic leaders in Pakistan to

issue 28 fatwas promoting the safety of the vaccine and the importance of vaccinating children. Relationship building on the ground with local health workers has led to a vaccine acceptance rate of 99.5%.

Local outreach and civic engagement in Nigeria yielded similar results. Thousands of volunteers worked with local Islamic scholars and schoolteachers to engage communities, raise support for vaccination, and build trust in health services. Nigeria has recorded no new polio cases in 2017, despite the terror of Boko Haram, which has killed polio health workers to prevent vaccination.

And this focus on civic engagement is not just limited to developing countries. Recent government ad campaigns on preventable diseases in the West show signs of a strong shift to positive reinforcement and softer messaging, rather than fear-mongering.

For example, the British government has used behavioral insight approaches which move away from relying on coercion, shaming or shock tactics in order to influence public behavior. A special behavioral insights team began to trial interventions based upon their understanding of the drivers of health and wellbeing.

Take smoking as an example. The team recognized one important tenet of behavior change—that it is much easier to substitute a similar behavior than to eliminate an entrenched one. On this basis, they explored the potential benefits of e-cigarettes to help people quit smoking, while also stressing the importance of an effective regulatory framework for these products, given the legitimate concerns around issues such as marketing to children. The findings from their interventions are encouraging, and e-cigarettes are now the most successful product at helping people quit smoking in the U.K.

The behavioral insights team has also had a positive impact on improved adult literacy rates, reduced school drop-out rates, added 100,000 people to the organ donor registry, and

increased the number of successful applicants to the police from minority ethnic communities. The methods are often very subtle, involving carefully tailored emails or text messages, but the outcomes are dramatic.

Now, the efforts I described are relatively simple but, as we can see, transformative on the ground. They are also relevant to our central concern—the state of civil discourse, because they demonstrate the importance and effectiveness of culturally and empirically aware engagement tactics to advocate for a certain position, or to promote behavior change.

And here Rotary can continue to take the lead in strengthening and promoting civil discourse. Since its inception, Rotary has imposed strict ethical standards on its members and advanced the ideal of human understanding and service to communities both around the corner and abroad. It is a model of civility and personal interaction that has led to tangible results in promoting peace, fighting disease, providing clean water, saving mothers and children, supporting education, and growing local economies.

The basis of this model is the Four-Way Test, a nonpartisan and nonsectarian guide Rotarians use to evaluate how they communicate with others. The test consists of just four simple questions that can be applied to any conversation or any issue. Of the things we think, say, or do, we ask ourselves:

Is it the truth?

Is it fair to all concerned?

Will it build goodwill and better friendships?

Will it be beneficial to all concerned?

This 4 Way Test may sound old-fashioned to some. But it has formed the bedrock of the work of hundreds of thousands of Rotarians over the decades in achieving tangible results in the quest to promote civil discourse, peace and understanding. And it is still relevant today, almost 90 years after it was created by Herb Taylor, then a member of the Rotary Club of

Chicago and later Rotary International President.

And as an aside, Chuck Walgreen Jr, the son of the founder of the drug-store chain, and also a member of the Rotary Club of Chicago, in 1955 adopted the 4 Way Test as the corporate vision statement for Walgreen's and an adaptation was reportedly placed on the wall of every pharmacy at Walgreen's—at least until they merged with Boots a few years ago.

So, therefore, our challenge is to find new and creative ways to talk with one another. And in that search we would be well advised to look at lessons of the polio eradication effort, and the successful interventions at a policy level which can positively influence behavior. We would be well advised to appreciate the limits of technology in enhancing social relations, and the paradoxical contentiousness, loneliness and mistrust that it can engender.

We would be well advised to address the issues of fear and conspiracy. While leadership from the top is important, long-term change needs to occur from the bottom up—one relationship and one conversation at a time.

The transformative change we seek cannot solely be delivered by the Facebooks and LinkedIns of the world. Civil discourse cannot rely on the very platforms which—if used unwisely—can perpetuate our present malaise.

Twenty years ago, Robert Putnam identified a sharp rise in Americans' civic disengagement over the last generation, with empty town hall meetings reflecting “a giant swing toward the individualist pole in our culture, society, and politics.” And his findings are still starkly relevant today.

So perhaps one of our best antidotes is to build on the impact of Rotary—the world's original social network. Not only do such organizations facilitate civil discourse, but they're also good for you. Putnam, when asked if friendship can have a greater impact on life expectancy than quitting smoking, concluded that it's a close call: “Joining and participating in one group cuts your odds of dying over the next year in half.”

200 years before Putnam examined the state of our nation, one of America's founding fathers knew well the strength of civil discourse. Thomas Jefferson said in 1800 that he "never

considered a difference of opinion in politics, in religion, in philosophy, as a cause for withdrawing from a friend." The key word is "friend." If we can find a way to approach one another

in fellowship, then the fists will uncurl and the daggers will bend and, finally, change becomes possible.

WINNER: TRANSPORTATION

"Growing Global: Lessons Lived and Learned"

By Janet Stovall for David Abney,
Chairman and CEO, UPS

//

Delivered at Alibaba Gateway 17,
Detroit, June 30, 2017

Years ago, long before I moved into my current role, I kept a large map of the world on a wall in my office.

But it wasn't the world most people were accustomed to seeing. On this map, the northern hemisphere was below the southern hemisphere. As you might imagine, it was pretty interesting to watch visitors trying to find the U.S. in a world turned upside down.

The real point of that map was to remind our people that it's a big world out there and the U.S. isn't naturally at the center of it.

Today, we see that reality more than ever in the growth of international trade. Fifty years ago, U.S. total trade equaled \$50 billion. Today, we import and export more than \$4 trillion annually in goods and services.

A growing percentage of those U.S. exports are bound for China. In fact, U.S. exports to China increased 115 percent between 2006 and 2015. Today, China's population, 1.4 billion strong, includes 350 million middle class consumers with a real desire for U.S. products and services. Think about that: China has a bigger middle class than the U.S. has people!

Today, China represents one-third of total consumption in Asia. Over the next 20 years, that's projected to grow to two-thirds.

And as China's economy grows, so does its influence. According to Oxford Economics, eight of the world's 50 largest cities in 2014, as measured by GDP, were in China. But by 2030, that number rises to 17. As a result,

by 2030, markets like Chengdu and Hangzhou will be just as important as cities like Dallas and Seoul are today.

So if you're serious about competing and growing, you cannot ignore China.

Of course, that's why many of you are here. And when it comes to China, the challenges and the opportunities that bring us together at Gateway 17, like the country itself, can be huge. Exporting to China carries a number of challenges, starting with regulatory and trade barriers. There also are language and cultural differences.

I'm well aware of the challenges and the opportunities, because UPS has been in China since 1988. We started with a joint venture with Sinotrans, China's largest logistics company. In 2002, we won the right to fly directly to and from China. And in 2004, we became the first fully-owned integrator in China. After 30 years, we have built a network that gives our U.S. customers a gateway to China.

I was in Beijing just two weeks ago, to attend the 5th Global CEO Council Roundtable Summit, and to meet with a number of Chinese leaders. I learned a lot, and was heartened that these leaders wanted to hear my insights on the investments and regulatory changes that China should undertake to create a world-class logistics market.

Because there's one thing we know: U.S. businesses of all sizes are looking beyond our borders. Many are looking hard at China. Some are already doing business there.

I'll give you an example: MyLocker. Net, based right here in Detroit. They sell custom t-shirts, hoodies and other clothing to schools, teams, leagues and other organizations. Then those organizations asked them to build online shops so they could sell to their customers, including ones in China. They turned to UPS. Now, you will see apparel decorated in Detroit and worn all over China.

UPS has been crossing borders for more than 40 years, growing our business globally and helping our customers grow theirs. In that time, we've lived and learned a lot, and passed it along to our customers. I think some of our lessons lived and lessons learned will be helpful to you, too.

Two of the biggest lessons we've lived by growing global ourselves are 1) understand customs; and 2) understand the culture and customize accordingly.

Lesson No. 1: understand customs. To sell around the world, you must "go native." In other words, you must learn and comply with the unique customs and trade requirements in each market. But you are not alone here.

Today, UPS guides many companies exporting to China. We connect more than 300 Chinese cities and the world with more than 200 weekly flights. We have a full range of supply chain services. We built this infrastructure so we can help businesses like yours reach your customers in China, and wherever else in the world they may be.

Lesson No. 2: understand the culture, and customize your products for

it. You must be ready to adapt to local tastes and to give consumers in a particular market what they want, when they want it. One way to determine what consumers in a market want is by partnering with local experts like Alibaba. You will hear much more about their capabilities throughout the day.

Also, thoroughly research your markets and eliminate a lot of problems that assumptions can cause. Today, we spend millions of dollars on research, so you don't have to start from scratch.

Our just-released Pulse of the Online Shopper study highlights trend in cross-border trade growth. Forty-seven percent of US customers purchased something from an international retailer in 2017. A localized shopping experience for these global shoppers is critical. Seventy-seven percent want the total cost of the order, including duties and fees, clearly stated. And 74 percent want to buy from a reputable retailer.

From the lessons we lived about customs, culture and customization, we learned a lot about capability and commitment.

We've helped make small businesses into big businesses for 110 years. Our goal is to make it easy for small businesses, tight on resources, to navigate the unfamiliar seas of global commerce. It's about you. We've built this global infrastructure for you to grow your business on.

In the last 24 months in China, we have expanded service offerings and

improved transit times across 33 metropolitan areas and opened in 21 new metros, each with more than 1 million people.

The foundation of our China business is two hubs: one in Shanghai, the other in Shenzhen. In Shenzhen, we offer 24-hour customs clearance services and around-the-clock connectivity to Hong Kong Customs to ensure seamless and efficient exporting. In Shanghai, we sort up to 36,000 pieces per hour so customers in the region can move products quickly and efficiently all over the world.

We start by leveraging UPSers around the world, their years of experience and the extensive UPS network of facilities and transportation assets. And, when necessary, we form smart partnerships with local integrators.

Here's how that looks in China: to get your products in front of Chinese consumers, UPS and Alibaba are collaborating to create a special toolkit that will make it possible for small and mid-sized U.S. companies, like many of you, to sell via Tmall Global. To get your product to the borders, you can count on the UPS supply chain, which at any given time moves 6% of our country's GDP and 3% of global GDP.

And finally, to get those products in Chinese consumers' hands, we recently announced a joint venture with a leading B2B (business-to-business) and B2C (business-to-consumer) domestic express delivery provider in China.

Shipment visibility, or lack of it, is probably one of the things that worries you most about doing business globally. It certainly was an issue for one of our customers, Align Technology. Align is a medical device company headquartered in San Jose, California. They make Invisalign, a clear polymer alternative to braces.

An orthodontist in China ships an impression of the patient's teeth to Align in the United States; Align manufactures the plastic aligners and ships them back to the customer in China. (Medical devices are not something you want to lose sight of at any point in the supply chain!) And since we operate an integrated global network with package-level tracking detail, Align can see where its products are at every step of the way.

We don't need a map to show us that today's world is very different than the one we knew at the start of our careers. And it's clear that it's going to keep changing, becoming ever more complicated and more competitive.

Affordable, fast trade leads to more trade, more jobs, and more prosperity. Exporting can help you compete, and UPS can help you take advantage of the opportunities that global trade provides, especially in a rapidly growing market like China.

We're excited to partner with you as you continue your global journey.

Thank you.

WINNER: CONTROVERSIAL OR HIGHLY POLITICIZED TOPIC

"Protecting Human Rights in Today's Europe"

By Katya Andrusz for Michael O'Flaherty, Director,
European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights



Delivered at University of Poznań,
University of Poznań, Poznań, Poland, Jan. 23, 2017

Good afternoon dear colleagues, friends,

As someone who has worked in the field of human rights for close to 30 years, it is with a sense of humility that I visit Poland. The history and the people of this country have taught us so much about the values that underpin European identity. I hope that I can do justice to that proud legacy in my remarks today.

Let me begin by quoting a Pole who spent his life in the service of freedom, and who remembered a time when humanity appeared to have plumbed the depths of degradation. Władysław Bartoszewski said in an address to the Millennium Session of the UN General Assembly:

"I remember the joy and the hope with which we greeted the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. They gave me strength when I found myself having to survive the ordeal of years of incarceration in Communist jails."

Earlier still, the great Polish jurist Rafael Lemkin contributed to the shaping of international human rights law when he conceptualised the crime of genocide. And the Genocide Convention will forever remain his legacy. Kofi Annan described Lemkin as having waged "a lifelong campaign for every human being's right to live in dignity", and whose "lifework offers an inspiring example of moral engagement".

The courage of the leaders and activists of the Solidarity movement has impressed me since the dark days of martial law. Indeed, I had the privilege of supporting the late Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki during his time as United Nations Special Rapporteur for the former Yugoslavia. I recall Mazowiecki's humanity and heartfelt wish to protect those caught up in the conflict.

Above all, I recall his integrity, moral clarity and determination.

There are many other great Poles whom I might mention, including, of course, Professor Krzysztof Skubiszewski, whom we honour today. But suffice it to acknowledge the array of Polish humanist champions, from poets through to a pope, from shipyard workers to secretaries of state. We are in their debt.

Dear Friends,

Just now I referred to the welcome given in 1948 to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. And it is always worthwhile revisiting the content of the declaration. Its first article remains as thrilling and challenging as ever, with the great statement: "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and in rights".

The story since 1948 is a remarkable one, with the development of a more or less comprehensive corpus of rights recognised in international law and a framework—albeit an imperfect one—for their international oversight. The global achievements were paralleled or further developed at the regional level.

Here in Europe we slowly elaborated the most sophisticated of all the international human rights legal frameworks. This was further strengthened by the embrace by the European Union of strong human rights commitments—including in the form of the European Charter of Fundamental Rights.

The Charter of Fundamental Rights, the drafting of which drew directly on the Universal Declaration, does not meddle in countries' internal affairs. It simply lays out the inalienable rights of each person living in the EU. These are rights that everyone is glad to have for themselves and their families, although some are less generous at the thought of them being

applied to others. But—as not only the Charter but also national constitutions stipulate—all people are equal before the law. There is not and cannot be any hierarchy of rights holders.

Each individual in the European Union has a claim to the rights of the Charter, and can invoke these rights before local courts wherever EU law applies. In this sense, the Charter and EU law in general are very much instruments of empowerment.

We have then in the EU an impressive human rights framework, which co-exists with the constitutional traditions and institutions of its Member States. It also of course draws on the European Convention of Human Rights, to which all EU Member States are party. Respect for this framework and all it entails is a condition for membership of the EU.

It is the primary role of my Agency, the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, to assist the EU and its Member States to uphold their fundamental rights commitments. In so doing we have a unique mandate—the only regional body of its kind in the world. Operating independently of the EU institutions we deliver evidence based advice and analysis to our law and policy makers. We also play a significant role in supporting civil society and promoting awareness of and respect for rights across the EU member states.

In our work at the national level we are well aware of how human and fundamental rights commitments must be applied in acknowledgement of and respect for the diversity of national identities. In fact, the Treaty on European Union stipulates clearly that the EU must respect "the national identities of the Member States". In this context it is my view that the Union provides

an additional source of identity to be proud of, in the same way that one is proud of one's own country.

Colleagues, friends,

No country or continent, however great its legacy, can afford to rest on its laurels. It was in 1998 that Pope John Paul II said: "It is not enough to possess freedom; it must be constantly achieved and recreated. It can be used for good or for ill..." His words can be transposed directly to the context of the global and European human rights protection systems.

Across the globe, human rights are in contention. In too many countries, the rights themselves and the systems that uphold them are questioned, challenged, ignored, or undermined. Sometimes it seems that human rights serves as a proxy battleground for political or ideological disputes.

Respect for rights is compromised by patterns of myth-making—one such being that rights are only for some people—which of course overlook the foundational principle that rights are not just for one minority or even many minorities. Human rights are for everyone.

We might well ask if we are facing a crisis of human rights. It will take me a little while before I answer this question, but please bear with me.

Here in Europe we are definitely seeing increasing intolerance, illustrated by rising hate crime and hate speech, particularly online.

We are also seeing a lack of solidarity. This is illustrated by the fact that EU Member States are failing to offer meaningful support to Italy and Greece in responding to the needs of tens of thousands of migrants. Within countries it can be observed in the toleration of ever-increasing levels of inequality.

Perhaps of greatest concern, though, is that we are seeing a growing tendency to question the very basics of Europe's human rights framework.

Allow me to go into a little more detail.

First: discrimination and hatred. A society can only flourish when all its members have the same opportunities

and enjoy the same rights, from education and career development through to freedom of conscience and freedom of religion.

Although we have made great strides in combating racism, xenophobia and hate crime, both legally and institutionally, we are seeing increasingly open and direct demonstrations of intolerance. Sometimes it seems as though the hatred is all-encompassing.

The patterns of hate speech and hate crime are to be found across the EU. The incidence of attacks is on the rise. Numerous groups are targeted. These include Jews and Roma. They also increasingly include foreigners—especially people who may look or dress differently. People perceived to be Muslims are often the target. We have been closely following these developments over the last year, including in the context of the migrant crisis. Each month we publish an account of the situation in 14 EU Member States, including Poland. The story—including here—is sobering and disturbing. I applaud the initiative of the Conference of Rectors of Academic Schools, who on 25 November issued a strong statement repudiating violence against foreigners, and calling for firm action by the authorities.

Beyond identifying attacks, another important test of whether the rights of a particular community are adequately protected is the level of fear among its members. Surveys carried out by the Fundamental Rights Agency show that this level of fear is high. Fear drains people's strength, preventing them from living their lives openly, as each of us has the right to do. So hate crime does not only affect one individual victim. It does lasting damage to entire communities.

Unacceptably, we see much evidence of communities wounded by hate crime and discrimination. 62% of Roma in a survey by the Fundamental Rights Agency said they had been discriminated against because of their ethnic background. 62%! And we must not forget that racism does not just affect minorities, but concerns us all.

Our societies are made up of everyone within them, and intolerance—whether racial or any other kind—has the potential to destroy these societies from the inside.

To foster cohesive societies based on mutual respect, it is vital that all those with a public voice are fully aware of their responsibility not to incite hatred. In a recent study by my Agency in which we interviewed more than 200 experts, we were told by one victim support service in Poland:

"It is extremely important for public figures, I am mostly talking about the people in power, to clearly, unambiguously and publicly talk about the topic of hate crime and to unequivocally express disapproval and criticism. This message has to reach the masses."

Of course, not only politicians are public figures. In this regard we see increasingly intolerant discourse in traditional and social media, often in the form of incitement to discrimination, hatred or violence. The growing reliance on the internet as the main source of information enables unverified statements to go viral almost instantly, making them difficult to challenge. At the same time, the internet facilitates the development of 'information bubbles' in which people only receive information that coincides with their own opinions. This then threatens to turn public debate into blocs of contradicting views in which rational arguments are ignored.

My second concern: freedom of speech. I have just spoken of criminal speech, which must be fought decisively. At the same time, however, I would like to make clear that I absolutely oppose the muzzling of freedom of expression. A free and pluralistic media play an essential role in ensuring our societies are based on democracy, human rights and the rule of law—the values upon which the EU is founded. This means that journalists, publishers, editors, and bloggers must be able to carry out their tasks without fear of intervention or reprisals.

A study by the Fundamental Rights Agency published just two months ago shows that ensuring the safety of those

working in journalism in the broadest sense is—or should be—a matter of serious concern for the EU and its Member States. State and non-state actors alike were found to exert direct and indirect pressure on journalists and media outlets.

For example, state authorities sometimes justify surveillance of journalists on the grounds of national security. This makes it more difficult for journalists to maintain confidential sources. In one case we cite in the study, a pre-trial investigation in one EU Member State revealed that the secret services had been authorised by a district court judge to wiretap 17 journalists in order to discover the source of a leaked government report.

This brings me, thirdly to: security concerns. At EU and national level, we need to discuss ways of increasing our capacity to combat terrorism and radicalisation, while remaining true to the rule of law and our human and fundamental rights commitments.

In the modifications to intelligence and surveillance legislation undertaken by many Member States in 2015, we see the perennial challenge of delivering national security in a manner that is respectful of rights—and especially that the inevitable infringements on rights comply with the non-negotiable principles of legality, necessity and proportionality. It helps when law-makers recall that a purpose of security policies in a modern state governed by the rule of law is to create a space for the realisation of fundamental rights.

Ensuring the safety of everyone in the EU is of critical importance. However, security must never be invoked as an excuse for the repression of democratic freedoms. Neither is it a zero-sum game between different groups, whereby the safety of one community can only be achieved at the expense of another community. Security measures can only work if they are respectful of human rights and work with and not against all the communities make up European societies.

Colleagues, friends,

Human rights are often regarded as

an abstract concept. But as my remarks to you have shown, the threats to those rights in Europe are very specific and concrete. In the same way, their protection depends on action that are analogously prosaic. If you will allow, I shall list some of the most essential elements of effective human rights protection—for Poland as for any other EU Member State.

(1) First and foremost is the importance of the rule of law. To quote Nils Muižnieks, the Council of Europe's Commissioner for Human Rights: "There can be no real human rights protection without mechanisms guaranteeing the rule of law, in particular by ensuring checks and balances among the different state powers."

Nonetheless, we are seeing an increasing challenge to the rule of law in many places around the EU.

One crucial aspect of the rule of law is the independence of the judiciary and of the institutions that go to make up the overall human rights framework. The checks and balances that ensure no one branch of government can become over-powerful are a precondition for democracy. And each Member State in the European Union can be proud to be a fully-fledged democracy; particularly those states that have so recently struggled against and surmounted totalitarian rule.

Constitutional courts and ombudsmen must be seen as vital to the lifeblood of our States—such courts and institutions are strengths to be nurtured and not problems to be solved. Constitutional courts are especially crucial in that they are the final arbiters on constitutional matters—other actors in the political and legal system should have the greatest respect for the independence needed to fulfil this role. Furthermore, challenges to the independence and impartiality of the judiciary may also lead to a breakdown in public trust in the fairness and quality of the justice system.

Human rights and the economy are not the subject of my remarks today, but I would add as an aside that governments as well as local authori-

ties must fully understand and take advantage of the fact that a strong judicial system fosters the investment the economy so much needs. From this perspective, respect for the rule of law should be regarded as a key element of sustainable economic growth. Businesses need to have certainty and guarantees of fairness in order to invest; and where these may be lacking, they put their money elsewhere.

(2) Also vital for the protection of human rights is a thriving and vibrant civil society. For a number of years now, civil society organisations in the EU and beyond have reported that the space in which to carry out their work is shrinking. They mention a reduction in access to financial resources, burdensome regulation, and fewer opportunities to access decision makers. In some places they tell of violent attacks and the harassment of human rights defenders. These issues will be the subject of close attention by the Fundamental Rights Agency in 2017 whereby the protection of civil society will be seen as much an internal as an external concern for the EU.

(3) Civil courage. I know it is not easy, but it is nonetheless vital: if you see hatred or discrimination, do not look away. Sometimes it is possible to intervene directly; sometimes it is a matter of perseverance. Whom should I put the victim in touch with; what legislation is contravened by this action; whom do I turn to if I am a victim myself? Ask yourselves these questions, and don't give up until you have an answer, however partial. The State must be held to account for the human rights obligations to which it has committed.

Of one thing you can be sure: the EU Agency for Fundamental Rights stands ready to support you. In arguing your case for human rights, make use of our analysis, data and advice. Also, make the best possible use of the resources, recommendations and findings of United Nations and Council of Europe bodies.

(4) I would like to make one last point on the protection of human rights, and

that is: learn from history, and learn it well. To quote yet another great Pole, the Nobel-prize winning poet Czesław Miłosz: “The living owe it to those who no longer can speak to tell their story for them.” Poland’s rich and often tragic history gives its people a keen sensitivity to the past. This must be harnessed for the present. School pupils and the general public alike need to receive a nuanced teaching of the past. This knowledge provides an opportunity to reflect on contemporary problems with a greater understanding, thus ensuring that history is used to heal and not divide. No country is composed entirely of heroes, and to reinterpret history as though this were the case does an acute disservice to all those who lived—and died—for their country.

Dear colleagues, friends,

You have listened to me for almost half an hour now, and you are perhaps

surprised that I have made little direct mention of the current circumstances in Poland. But rather than reiterating the authoritative commentary and recommendations of the Venice Commission, the United Nations Human Rights Committee, the European Commission and others, I have sought to examine the situation in a broader context. And as I hope I have made clear, there is no EU country in which human rights are not at risk.

Let me close by answering the question I posed earlier. Do we have a crisis of human rights? No, I don’t think we do. But we do have a major crisis of commitment. Human rights cannot be viewed as an optional extra that can be sacrificed. They are the cornerstone of our identity. Europe will have failed if we fail on this issue, which is so close to the values on which the EU was founded.

We must have the courage of our convictions, the courage to speak out against human rights violations, and the courage to act. With this courage, with energy and with good will, we can overcome this crisis to ensure that human rights protection does not become a hollow shell, but remains at the beating heart of our societies.

I will leave the final words to Pope John Paul II, who said so powerfully during his address to the UN General Assembly in 1979:

“Although each person lives in a particular concrete social and historical context, every human being is endowed with a dignity that must never be lessened, impaired or destroyed but must instead be respected and safeguarded...”

It is our challenge, as individuals and societies to honour that lofty vision.

Thank you.

WINNER: DIVERSITY

“How We Can All Help End Domestic Violence and Abuse”

By Craig Millar for Lubna Latif,
Domestic Violence and Abuse Counsellor



Delivered at TEDx Bolton, University of Bolton,
Bolton, England, Nov. 23, 2017

We all know that our relationships are one of life’s great joys and also one of life’s great challenges!

For more people than you may believe, those challenges are huge.

In fact, they can be life-threatening.

I work here in Bolton with men and women that are experiencing domestic abuse.

Sometimes physical, sometimes emotional.

People who live in fear of the ones they love or perhaps once loved.

When I speak to people about my work, they can feel a little uncomfortable at first, but they soon start to ask questions like, ‘Why don’t they just leave?’ or ‘why do they take so long to tell anyone?’

And I get to tell them about the scale of the problem.

And to see the look of shock on their

faces when I say that one in four women will experience abuse in their lifetime.

And one in six men.

I talk about how the damaging effects ripple out to children and indeed all of us.

Domestic abuse and violence cost us in the UK a whopping £23 billion every year!

Like many things to do with us humans, the causes of this are complicated.

Power, control and fear are certainly important.

But I believe the solution is surprisingly simple.

The best way to create a world where people don’t hide their biggest problems is to make it easier to talk about them.

And that my friends are where we all come in.

We all have a role to play.

And by doing that well, we’ll make all our relationships better.

It encourages our friends and family open up, speak their truth and perhaps even to admit their flaws.

Let me tell you about 3 of the most important lessons I’ve learned about how we can do things better.

Firstly, we need to remember that people’s truth is not always as it appears.

I was and actually still am a bit of a nerd.

I used to go to my local library and read the newspapers with all the retired men in the newspaper room.

And I remember being sat at the table once, and I read the same story in three or four different papers.

What I realised that day was that depending on what paper you read,

you would get slightly different versions of the same story.

I also noticed that details like ages and dates were different in different papers.

And I thought to myself, how can the same story be told so differently?

There and then, I decided that I would always take what I read in papers with a pinch of salt and that the truth was somewhere between what was reported in the papers and what people said happened.

In many ways, us people are the same.

We show different sides of ourselves in different situations.

We are experts at hiding things from people and sometimes from even ourselves.

And we have to remember this to better understand domestic abuse.

The second thing is to let go of the myths, stereotypes and assumptions that surround domestic violence.

“That he or she must like it” “It’s a working-class problem” and “It’s part of their culture” are statements that I’ve heard whilst talking to people about this topic.

These beliefs need to be challenged, debunked, and put on the same outdated belief shelf that houses “The world is flat” and “eating the crusts of your bread makes your hair go curly”.

And some of this thinking gets into our language.

For example:

Let’s look at The most common question that I get asked by people: ‘Why don’t they just leave?’

There are lots of reasons why this question is not helpful for anyone experiencing abuse.

Primarily because it’s a judgement based assumption.

We are judging that person for not leaving and so think less of them and secondly, we are assuming that it’s easy for a person to leave an abusive relationship.

But did you know that the most serious harm or threat of even murder occurs when a person does leave?

A victim will know this and this is

what keeps them frozen in fear of this potentially happening to them or their children.

But there is a much better question we could ask.

We could ask, what is keeping that person in the abusive relationship?

There’s a real contrast in the emphasis of the question and rather than “victim blaming” we are instead trying to understand the dynamics of the abuse and use our empathy.

Our words do matter.

Although it may feel hard to understand why someone stays in an abusive relationship, we need to lose our assumptions if we want to make a difference.

The reality is that there are lots of reasons why someone will stay in an abusive relationship—fear, low self-esteem, belief that no-one will believe them, they think it’s not that bad.

I remember working with one lady who had told me about how her dad used to ‘leather her mother’ when she was a child.

Those were her exact words— “getting leathered”.

I can imagine that as a child, how terrifying that must have been to witness.

What had happened to this lady though was that over time, she had begun to normalise violence and she went on to tell me that she hadn’t got it as bad as her mother.

During the course of my risk assessment with her, I asked if about whether she had been strangled.

She replied quite matter of fact that she would wake up with his hand around her throat on a daily basis.

And yet she thought that she didn’t have it as bad as her mother.

I challenged this belief with my client very gently.

I also talk about it during my training sessions to demonstrate the distorted thinking that can occur when subjected to trauma at a young age and continued abuse as an adult.

By starting to understand the complex dynamics of domestic abuse and educating ourselves on the risk indicators, we can begin to support people

a lot more effectively, so that they can access specialist support.

So ask yourself, are my thoughts, attitudes and beliefs about this subject victim blaming or am I choosing words that are more understanding, compassionate and supportive.

Finally, let’s remember that domestic violence can happen to anyone.

I know this because it happened to me.

I fell in love during summer of 1993 whilst I was on a working holiday in Greece, in between studying for my Masters.

In hindsight, there were indicators, but I just didn’t see them, quite frankly, because I didn’t know what to look out for.

Whilst on holiday, my boyfriend threw a massive rock at me when I decided that I wanted to go back to my flat on my own.

And in my mind, I had playfully run away from him and he told me that I was crying crocodile tears when he was leaving to go home.

I couldn’t understand how he could be so hurtful but because my feelings were so strong for him.

I put that to the side and pursued the relationship.

As our relationship blossomed, he continued to be emotionally abusive towards me.

He would make derogatory comments about my body.

He’d call me boring.

One night, he locked me out of our apartment once after an argument and refused to give me the keys.

So I had to sleep on a neighbours couch for the night!

Who embarrassingly I didn’t even know.

Do you know what the ironic thing was?

I was actually working for a domestic abuse service at the time!

However, I do believe, that it was because I was working there, that I was able to spot the signs and end the relationship after 4 years.

The average length of time is 5 years to leave.

I got my life back and a much deeper understanding of the people who I help in work.

Domestic abuse is more common than we think and it can happen to anyone.

As one of my clients said, “You think you’re alone. But you’re not. It’s surprising when you tell people what you’ve been through and so many tell you, oh I’ve been there too.”

Although we all feel worried about

talking about this with someone or indeed any difficult topic.

Let’s remember the way we can help is relatively simple.

In fact, it’s more about stopping some things than starting.

It’s about letting go of stereotypes, assumptions, false ideas and the idea that we have to do it alone.

It’s about really listening to people and remembering how good they can be at hiding things.

We all struggle with relationships.

They are hard and there are curveballs that we just didn’t anticipate at all.

However, I do believe that we can live in a world where abuse is a thing of the past.

And we all have a role to play in making it happen.

Let’s break the silence and start talking.

Because it’s hard to be happy in a world where many are not.

WINNER: ECONOMICS

“U.S. and Canada: Sharing a Continent by Chance; Friends by Choice”

By Richard Roik for Jim Carr,
Canadian Minister of Natural Resources



Delivered to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce’s Institute
for 21st Century Energy, Washington, D.C., March 29, 2017

Thank you, and good morning.

There is a place in northwestern Washington State called Sumas, but it could really be anywhere in Small Town, U.S.A. It’s a community of 1,300 people, just 20 miles off an Interstate. There’s a parade and fireworks display every summer, and the town boasts both an American Legion and a branch of the Bank of America. It’s as American as the stars and stripes—except that, technically, a lot of Sumas is in Canada. Some parts of the town are as much as a mile north of the 49th Parallel.

Sumas is not unique. There are curiosities like it all along our 5,500-mile border.

At Dundee, Quebec, and Fort Covington, New York, the owners of a hotel once painted the international boundary line on the floor of their bar, right beside the pool table.

Many houses still straddle the border, which means the people in these homes might eat in the United States and sleep in Canada.

These stories remind us that there is very little that separates us. We share similar values, mutual interests and the same ambitions. We marry each other, shop in each other’s stores and visit each other’s tourist attractions.

As an American journalist noted many years ago, “Canadians are generally indistinguishable from the Americans, and the surest way of telling the two apart is to make the observation to a Canadian.”

It’s true. We may be polite to a fault, but Canadians are passionate about their national identity. We consider it a mounting crisis that a Canadian hockey team has not won the Stanley Cup since 1993.

But today, I’d like to talk about another aspect of the Canada–U.S. relationship that you may not know, achieving things you might not expect. It’s a truly unique economic relationship that is larger and stronger than ever. One unrivalled by any two countries, anywhere in the world.

It starts with the more than \$1 trillion (U.S.) in trade and investment between us each year. To put that in context, nearly \$2 billion in goods and services—and some 400,000 people—cross the border every day. That’s more than \$80 million of trade every hour. Of every day.

No other country buys more American-made goods than Canada. We buy more from the U.S. than all the member nations of the European Union. Combined.

Canada is the number one customer for two-thirds of U.S. states, and in the top three for 48 different states. All of this trade means jobs. For both countries.

Here in the United States, it means nine million jobs. Across every Congressional district.

Our economies are so interconnected that whether a car is assembled in Detroit, Michigan, or Oshawa, Ontario, the parts for it will cross the border five or six times.

And nowhere is this shared prosperity more pronounced—or more important—than in our natural resource sectors: the vital backbone to today’s economy and tomorrow’s clean growth. From Canadian softwood that’s used to build American homes to minerals that are used in high-tech manufacturing. And, of course, Canada and the U.S. share the closest energy relationship in the world.

As Prime Minister Justin Trudeau said in Houston earlier this month, “Nothing is more essential to the U.S. economy than access to a secure, reliable source of energy. And Canada is that source.”

A few quick examples.

With the third-largest crude oil reserves in the world, Canada provides

the United States with 43 percent of all the crude it imports. Alberta alone sends 2.5 million barrels a day to the U.S. Some 86 different pipelines criss-cross our border.

And it's not just oil and gas.

No fewer than 34 transmission lines cross our border in a truly integrated grid. Canada supplies more electricity and uranium to the U.S. than any other country.

In the case of electricity, Canada provides enough energy each year to power almost seven million American homes. And Canadian uranium generates six percent of America's electricity—enough to power one in every 17 of your homes.

This energy integration benefits both our countries by increasing our energy security, lowering energy and capital costs, and enhancing reliability of supply.

It also creates good, middle-class jobs at the thousands of American companies that supply Canada's energy industry.

Our two countries are also working together on clean energy. For example, harmonizing our energy efficiency standards has lowered operating costs for businesses and helped create an integrated market for the clean technologies that will transform traditional resource sectors and open up entire new industries.

Canada and the United States are also major markets for one another's mining sectors.

The U.S. exports almost \$40 billion worth of minerals and metals to Canada, creating thousands of American jobs. Canada, in turn, exports \$49 billion of minerals and metals to the United States—including 60 percent of the aluminum Americans use to manufacture planes, cars and other products.

Our countries' steel industries are equally integrated, and Canada is the number one destination for U.S. steel products, supporting a key industry that employs hundreds of thousands of Americans.

The same goes for forestry.

Canadian softwood plays a major role in building American homes. In fact, one-third of all the softwood used in American construction comes from Canada—enough to build one million American homes.

Sourcing this lumber from another supplier would increase construction costs, making home ownership more expensive for Americans.

How much more expensive?

The National Association of Home Builders estimates that for every \$1,000 (U.S.) increase in home prices, another 153,000 American households would no longer qualify for average mortgages.

And it goes both ways.

Canada, for example, is a major consumer of American forest products. We import almost \$5 billion of American paper products every year, along with \$615 million of American-made furniture.

These numbers confirm what we know in our hearts.

The United States and Canada are connected like no others. Our economies, our businesses, our infrastructures and even our family ties depend on keeping our border as open as possible, with as few impediments to trade as possible.

Seamless supply chains allow our countries to keep costs low, create jobs and generate tax revenues for all levels of government.

Border adjustment taxes, import tariffs and other trade barriers make us nervous. They demand that we have bean counters counting each transit

and laying taxes with each transaction, hurting not just the Canadian economy but the American economy as well, costing good jobs on both sides of the border.

Americans understand this as well as we do. I was in Houston with our Prime Minister for CERA Week, the world's largest energy conference. While I was there, I met with six cabinet secretaries. I spoke with 11 CEOs or their designate. Industry leaders from some of the world's largest companies. And not a single person said they wanted a border adjustment tax. To a person, they said they are free traders.

So are we.

Now, more than ever, our focus should be on working closer together, expanding our economic opportunities and enhancing our shared prosperity.

So I want to end where I began, in Sumas, Washington.

Legend has it that Sumas' overlapping of the border was due to a surveyor's mistake. But like everything else in our country's 150-year history, we resolve these things with you in peaceable ways. And by forming committees.

In this case, it's an International Boundary Commission that has been maintaining the peaceful border for more than a century. The Commission's jointly operated website hails its efforts as a "true sharing of resources, intellect and goodwill in pursuit of a common objective."

We are two proud nations, sharing the same continent by chance. But we are friends—and economic partners—by choice.

Let's continue to work together as friends, share together as neighbours and trade together as partners.

We have come too far and achieved too much to settle for less.

Thank you.

WINNER: HEALTHCARE

"Those People"

By Diane Suchetka for Dr. Akram Boutros,
President and CEO, The MetroHealth System



Delivered at the Annual Meeting of The MetroHealth System,
Cleveland, June 9, 2017

“In these days of difficulty, we Americans everywhere must—and shall—choose the path of social justice ...

“...the path of faith, the path of hope, and the path of love toward our fellow man.”

Those were the words of Franklin Roosevelt as he campaigned for president in 1932, the year the Great Depression drove America to its knees and 12 million people—nearly a quarter of the workforce—found themselves begging for a job.

The Great Depression is long behind us; the Great Recession, too.

Locally, Cleveland is in the midst of a magnificent rebirth that is creating jobs, stirring creativity and inspiring hope. But FDR’s insistence that “we choose the path of social justice” is just as essential today as it was 85 years ago.

We cannot lift some members of this community and ignore others. We cannot leave behind our brothers and sisters, our mothers and fathers, our neighbors and friends. We cannot—ever—slip from the path of faith and hope and love toward our fellow man.

To do so would be heartless.

That’s not what Cleveland is and it is not what MetroHealth is—ever was—or ever will be.

One hundred and eighty years ago the leaders of this newborn city cemented Cleveland’s commitment to social justice when they founded the City Infirmary, a place for the sick and poor who had, before then, been driven out of town into the wilderness to survive—or not—on their own. The infirmary grew and evolved into a hospital. And it moved. But it has never forsaken its mission of serving everyone, no matter what they look like, how sick they are or how empty their pockets.

Today City Hospital is MetroHealth, a health system still committed to social justice—so committed to social justice that in the past six years of talking and planning and trying, we never gave up on the idea of rebuilding our hospital, the hospital for all people.

And you never gave up on us.

Today we are here to say thank you for that support.

Thank you again County Executive Armond Budish, County Council President Dan Brady, Mayor Frank Jackson and City Council President Kevin Kelley for your steadfast support of MetroHealth and its mission.

Thank you Miguel and Denise Zubizarreta for building the Zubizarreta House, our home-away-from-home for patients with spinal cord and other paralyzing injuries. Now those patients have a comfortable—and comforting—place to live after they undergo surgery, a place where they can learn to use the electrical stimulation devices that allow them to stand up from their wheelchairs and feed themselves and hug their kids long after they thought they’d never do those things again.

Thank you to the Char and Chuck Fowler Family Foundation, the Giant Eagle Foundation, the George Gund Foundation, the David & Inez Myers Foundation and the Elisabeth Severance Prentiss Foundation for the nearly \$1 million you have entrusted to us in the past year. Your generosity helps us take even better care of the people of Cuyahoga County.

Thank you to the faith community, groups like the United Pastors in Mission, who championed our work. Thank you Gail Long, Gloria Aron

and the many individuals who wrote letters and made phone calls and spoke up for us at public meetings and private gatherings and dinner tables across the county.

Thank you to all of the organizations who partner with us to help school children, pregnant women, premature babies and so many others.

Thank you to our patients who trust us with their care.

Thank you to our MetroHealth employees—all 7,400 of them—for working harder this year than ever before. Your devotion to MetroHealth and our mission of caring for everyone is the only reason we were able to serve nearly 50,000 new patients in 2016 and to care for them close to home in one of our more than 30 locations without them having to worry about whether they have insurance—or money.

And thank you to our Board of Trustees who had the foresight and courage to agree to go to the market on MetroHealth’s own credit and sell \$946 million in bonds to rebuild our hospital and revitalize our West Side campus.

When I came to MetroHealth four years ago, no one, including me, believed that was possible. But 15 days ago—on May 25—that money was deposited in our account.

This will bring to fruition the largest self-funded county hospital project in the history of the United States of America.

Now, we’ve reached the part of my speech where I could tell you, like most annual meeting speeches do, about the great year 2016 was for us. I could tell you about our new health centers and our expanded services and our financial results.

But you can read all about those in our Annual Report, which you’ll receive on your way out.

I could tell you about all the obstacles we have faced, too. But, there's also no reason to rehash the struggles we've overcome to get here.

What matters is that we are here, that together we built trust, that we never forgot our mission, that we kept our sights on doing right by the people of Cuyahoga County—all of them—and that we believed.

We believed that we could do more, that the county's and city's futures were tied to MetroHealth's. And research from the College of Urban Affairs at Cleveland State proved us right. It concluded that the rebuilding of our campus will support 5,600 jobs for people in Cuyahoga County; 3,200 of those for residents of the city of Cleveland.

Those jobs will increase household income by \$360 million in Cuyahoga County during the years of construction. And that income will generate almost \$95 million in tax revenue.

Those jobs and that money will go, just like our care, to all people. We're committed to making sure that our construction business goes to firms that hire—or are owned by—Latinos, women and African Americans.

The same philosophy that guides our care, guides our spending. We will not leave anyone out.

The economic benefit doesn't end at our campus. Our plans have already helped ignite the rebuilding of our neighborhood. They are bringing improvements in mass transit along West 25th Street, new businesses, better housing, new neighbors. We can look out our windows and see that the neighborhood around our campus is becoming what we know it can be, what it should be, what it must become: a neighborhood shimmering with energy—and opportunity—for those who live here now and those who are moving in, a neighborhood that generates hope and expands the great renaissance of Cleveland.

There were some who said it couldn't be done. There were some

who said it shouldn't be done. And there were some who asked why.

Why invest in the county hospital?

They said MetroHealth and its buildings are good enough “for those people.”

“For those people.”

Well let me tell you who some of those people are.

Those people are Endia Reynolds.

Two weeks from today, Endia will finish the 10th grade at Lincoln-West School of Science Health. That's the high school we opened inside our hospital last fall, the first high school inside any hospital in the country.

Endia is the youngest of eight. One sister is a nursing assistant, a brother owns a towing company, her other siblings, she says, are just getting by. And, to be honest, Endia kind of was just getting by, too. She wasn't really all that excited about school.

Then, back in February, she spent half a day in our Metro Life Flight communications office. And she fell in love.

What really made her happy, she says, was seeing the Life Flight employees working as a team.

“Technology is just taking over,” she says. “You don't really see people working together anymore.”

Endia listened from the communications office that day as the Life Flight crew rushed to a family that had been in a terrible car accident and airlifted them to MetroHealth. She watched crew members jog down the hallway as they wheeled them in: a father, a sobbing little girl and a mother who, even with her injuries, reached her hand from her gurney to her little girl's, to try to comfort her as they were delivered into the hands of our life-saving trauma team.

“It opened my eyes,” Endia says. “I appreciate more now.”

“This school,” she says, “basically shows you that you can't take anything for granted because you never know what could happen.”

What happened to Endia that day is this: She can't wait to get to school now.

Assistant principal Endora Knight Neal sees it in Endia's face every morn-

ing; she hears it in Endia's voice when she asks, over and over, “When can I go back to Life Flight again?”

Now Endia knows she wants to be a Life Flight nurse. She wants to be part of that team.

She's studying harder. She's getting better grades. And she's more committed to making her brothers' and sisters' wish come true—that she be the first in her family to go to college.

That's why we opened a high school inside our hospital.

Those people are Shedrick Jordan. He's 34, a happy guy who shares a duplex in Cleveland with his grandmother and loves to play video games.

MetroHealth hired Shedrick three years ago—through the job training program at the Cuyahoga County Board of Developmental Disabilities. He started out as an intern in our kitchen. He did so well that after eight months he was promoted to part-time porter. Another year or so later, he was doing such a great job, we hired him full-time.

Now that he's working 40 hours a week, Shedrick can buy the Converse tennis shoes and that PlayStation 3 and the video games he loves. His kid brother still wins every time, but, hey, he's got youth on his side.

When you ask Shedrick what he likes about his job, he says it feels good to know you're making your own money, relying on nobody but yourself.

“The money's great,” he says, “but you meet new people, too.”

“That is the best part about the job.”

Shedrick's made friends here. And he's done a few other things, too. He's joined the gym at MetroHealth. He's working on getting healthier. And moving up from his part-time position means we got to hire another person from the developmental disabilities program. Phil started last month. He's our fifth employee from the program. And that's just in the kitchen.

Shedrick helps Phil and all the new employees learn the ropes.

“I get to take them under my wing,” he says, that big, beautiful smile getting bigger. “I teach them everything I know.”

And working full-time means Shedrick doesn’t need that Social Security Disability check anymore or the government-funded health care that came with it. Instead of depending on taxpayers, Shedrick is a taxpayer.

That’s why we’re committed to training people with developmental disabilities.

And those people are Kim Jaworski.

On August 18, 2014, Kim and his wife, Carol, were at home, in Westlake, settling in for the evening to watch a football game.

They asked their son, Robert, to join them.

Robert was 22 then and he was different from their other son. He wrote long rambling letters to the police saying people were molesting him. He heard voices. He called 9-1-1 and told dispatchers his parents were trying to kill him. He walked out of his college apartment and tried to get into a neighbor’s apartment—naked.

Kim and Carol had taken him to psychologists and psychiatrists. And they had him hospitalized, three times. But hospitals can’t keep patients unless they’re a threat to themselves or others.

Robert’s smart. He can carry a conversation in German, he speaks a little Mandarin, too, and he definitely knows the language that got him discharged—over and over again—from psychiatric hospitals.

And so he was home that night. And he grabbed a kitchen knife—one of the biggest in the house—walked into his parents’ bedroom and stabbed his mother and father, 14 times, each.

(9-1-1 TAPE OF CAROL PLEADING FOR HELP PLAYS.)

Carol spent 10 days at MetroHealth. But Kim took the worst of it.

One stab hit an inch below his heart, another his liver, another sliced open an artery in his back.

Kim died at the first hospital paramedics took him to. But our Life Flight crew was there, ready to transport him to MetroHealth. The team performed CPR—for four minutes.

And they brought him back.

Then Kim lost his pulse again.

They brought him back again.

His heart slowed once more. This time, the team opened his chest and drained the blood that had accumulated around his heart, blood that was keeping his heart from beating.

When Life Flight landed at MetroHealth, the team wheeled him straight into surgery.

Five hours later, the trauma surgeon walked out of the operating room and told Scott—Kim and Carol’s other son—that it didn’t look good.

Kim made it.

It took him seven weeks in the hospital, two weeks in inpatient rehab, weeks more of rehabilitation at home. But as soon as he was able, he and Carol drove to Northcoast Behavioral Healthcare to be with Robert.

Robert tried to apologize. But Kim stopped him.

“Don’t worry,” he told his son. “You didn’t do it.”

They knew it was his illness. And we all know you don’t stop loving your kid because he’s sick.

The following July, a judge ruled that Robert was not guilty by reason of insanity.

He’s been at Northcoast ever since.

He’s on medication now for his schizoaffective disorder. He’s back to his old self. And he doesn’t hear that voice anymore—the voice of the Chinese secret service agent telling him “If you don’t kill your mom and dad, we’re going to kill you.”

Kim and Carol still visit Robert at least twice a week—every week. They take him books so he can keep studying, maybe finish his degree one day. They talk and laugh, like old times, with the son they never once gave up on.

In between those visits, Kim volunteers—with Survivor Recovery Services at MetroHealth. He visits other trauma

patients, tells them his story, lets them see for themselves that if he made it, they can, too.

“My wife has told me 100 times: ‘you’ve found your calling,’ Kim says.

“And I have.

“Something good happened from all this.”

There may be more good to come.

Kim is working with the manager of MetroHealth’s Survivor Recovery Services to change the system that kept Robert from getting the help he needed. He wants to make sure that what happened to him and his family never happens to anyone else.

That’s why we continue to commit time and money and energy to a trauma center for those people who end up beaten or shot or stabbed.

I’d like to ask Endia and Shedrick and Kim to stand so you can thank them for their inspiration, that inspiration I know you will carry with you for days to come.

We tell these stories for a reason.

They are stories of those people, the people MetroHealth has cared for, supported, and championed for 180 years. They are stories of social justice.

They are not stories of the hand-outs people often think of when they hear the phrase “social justice.” Social justice is not just giving food stamps to someone who is hungry or public housing to someone who has no home. Social justice is giving people that one thing they need to find their gift, to find their passion, to harness that innate human goodness that lives deep inside each one of us.

We see that goodness every day at MetroHealth. We also see how easily it vanishes when someone loses a job or their way or doesn’t have enough to eat or good health.

When survival becomes your No.1 concern, there’s no energy left for doing good.

But when you have what you need to survive, goodness follows.

What we—no, what you—have

done for Endia and Shedrick and Kim is help them find their gifts, gifts that are helping others in our community.

It turns out that what's good for those people is good for all of us.

What MetroHealth really accomplished last year—what you accomplished—are the stories you've just heard.

Thousands more stories like these happen at MetroHealth every year. And there are thousands more to come.

The future. That's what this is about.

I see a future where all the workers Shedrick has helped learn the ropes are helping others find jobs and friendship and independence.

I see a future where Kim has fixed the system to make sure those with mental illness get the help they need, the help that keeps their families safe.

And I see a future where Endia is standing here on this stage, in my place, the CEO of MetroHealth, thanking you on behalf of a thriving community and its great public hospital.

We could tell you that all we've been trying to do these past six years is just build a new hospital. But that wouldn't be true.

What we've been trying to build is a good life for everyone who lives here—and hope—hope that gets passed from one good person to the next, hope that builds a better Cleveland, a better world that ignites the future we all dream of.

And now we can do that, thanks to you.

WINNER: LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

"What the World Needs Now from Business"

Written and delivered by Dain Dunston,
Author and Leadership Coach



Delivered at The Ocean Exchange Conference,
Savannah, Georgia, Oct. 10, 2017

Think about this question: what does the world need from business?

It's not a question business leaders ask very often, beyond asking what our customers need.

The business community is good at communicating what WE need.

We're good at telling local governments what tax breaks and free services we'll need to open a business in their area.

We're good at telling state governments what infrastructure we need to keep our costs down and what concessions we need to be able to hire more people.

And we're good at joining together in industry groups so we can pay lobbyists in Washington to tell the Federal government what laws we need changed so we can go about our business with the minimum hassles from regulators.

We're good at telling the world what WE need.

So maybe it's time for us to ask what the world needs from us.

(PAUSE)

Who is the world?

We need to be very specific about the language we use.

If we ask, "What do people need from business?" then it sounds like we're talking about our employees or our customers.

But the world is bigger than that.

If we ask, "What does the community need from business?" then it sounds like we're talking about our town or our local charities.

And the world is bigger than that.

If we ask, "What does our society need from business?" then it sounds like we mean our nation, our American society.

The world is bigger than that, too.

And if we ask, "What does the planet need from business?" then it sounds like we're talking about polar bears.

And the world is definitely bigger than polar bears.

The world is all of that and all of us. And right now, the world needs business to think a little differently.

(PAUSE)

The world needs business to be different in three ways.

It needs us to be Social.

It needs us to be Serviceful.

And it needs us to be Sustainable.

The world needs us to be those

three things ... not "by the way" or "on the side" or "after the fact."

It needs us to be all those things at the core of our business models.

(PAUSE)

The world needs business to be more social. What does that mean?

It means that all business is social. All business is about people. The people who work for you. The people who buy from you. The people who supply you. The people who invest in you. And the people who know the people who do all those things.

The world is asking business to understand that we have a social responsibility to all those people.

And, that business will be held accountable for actions that are "anti-social."

These days, what happens in Vegas doesn't stay in Vegas anymore. Same with what happens anywhere in the world. We're in a global economy now.

Business can't be a suckerfish on the belly of society. It has to serve. That means more than just asking if the world wants fries with whatever your selling. It means reframing your business strategy to serve the common good.

These days, it's not enough to donate a little money to charity and call that "social responsibility."

Zappos has made a business of "delivering happiness" and have tried to extend that beyond just their customers.

A few years ago, they were outgrowing their facilities in Las Vegas so they began the typical search for some land to build a nice suburban campus.

But then their CEO, Tony Hsieh asked if there was something the city of Las Vegas needed from them.

It turned out there was. Downtown Las Vegas was an empty shell of a town, with vacant lots and empty buildings.

So Zappos bought the old city hall building and some other buildings in the downtown area and moved their company there. Then they started developing the blocks around them and in between their buildings.

Today, that area is turning into a vital downtown area, with apartments and stores and buildings full of start-up businesses.

They took a stand for making their city better. That's their social responsibility.

Today, the world wants your business to stand for something. They want to see that your business model is designed to help your customers make a better world.

If you can't stand for something that resonates, people won't want to buy from you and they won't want to work for you.

To resonate, you have to stand for something bigger than your bottom line. You have to stand for something that serves the world.

Business is no longer in an age when it can float on top of society and siphon off profits. We have a social responsibility to work for the health of the world in which we do business.

That's what the world needs from us: a business culture that's also part of the social fabric of life.

(PAUSE)

The world needs business to be serviceful.

We live in a time when Government is gridlocked in a partisan standoff

where compromise and reconciliation are considered dirty words.

Business had a hand in creating that situation. And now the world needs business to roll up its sleeves and solve some problems.

Because in business, we know there's nothing that can't be negotiated and we know the best negotiations are the ones where everyone wins.

Business can't sit on the sidelines and say, "We only care about the economy. The rest has nothing to do with us."

That's nuts, because you can't separate the economy from the environment or the quality of schools or the basic social fabric of the communities in which you do business. And you can't separate those communities from the rest of the world.

The Coca-Cola Company has a hundred-year history of careful management of the water in their bottling plants. The quality of their product and their ability to maintain their market share depends right out of the gate on the quality of the water they put in it.

Then one of their plants came under fire from the people of Kerala in India. They were in the middle of a drought and the people of the region came to believe that Coke was part of the problem. They thought they were taking all the water, putting it in Coke and exporting it to the rest of India.

First, Coke tried to explain. "No, we get our water from really deep wells that don't affect the local watershed." But nobody believed them.

So then they decided to get "serviceful" and admit that if there was a water shortage problem in their state then it was their problem, too.

And they moved from water management to watershed management.

First in Kerala, and now globally.

They now understand that their operations have a major effect on the watersheds where they're located and that those watersheds have a major effect on the future their operations.

They're saying, "We can't just care about the water quality in our plant. We

have to be part of the solution for the water quality in the entire watershed."

Every business lives in a "social watershed" in which we depend on the healthy flow of people, ideas and economic growth. The world needs business to take responsibility for the health of that social watershed.

The world needs you to ask, "What's your watershed?"

Because that's where you can make the biggest difference to the your company and the world.

(PAUSE)

The world needs business to be sustainable.

Two years ago, the CEO of Unilever, one of the biggest consumer products company in the world, revealed that their 'sustainable living brands'—like Ben & Jerry's and Lifebouy—delivered stronger and faster growth.

He said, "These brands accounted for half Unilever's growth and grew at twice the rate of the rest of the business."

And then he announced that they were going to convert every single brand to match the sustainable brands.

Because it's very clear to them that that's what the world wants.

Now, in the United States, many of us in the business community are skeptical about climate change and the benefits of going green.

Well, let me tell you something. You're customers aren't. And neither are a lot of your investors.

The US can say they're leaving the Paris Accords, but Unilever can't. UPS can't. Coke can't. Because they do business in every other country in the world that's still in the accord.

The economy is part of an ecosystem that depends on the continuing health of all its parts.

And right now, our ecosystem has some health issues.

Half the world's population lives on less than \$2 a day. Climate change is threatening drinking water supplies. In the U.S., the middle class is falling behind. And, as we've learned in the last decade, things that happen in far away places can have a profound affect on what happens here.

Business has to be part of the solution.

Study after study shows that companies which focus on creating sustainability in their use of resources outperform those who don't.

Sound counter-intuitive?

The world rewards those who give it what it needs.

And there's another kind of sustainability, and that's the sustainability of companies that are built to last.

Great companies continue to provide value to their customers and their communities for generations. They sustain the public good.

When we put pressure on companies to maximize short-term gains at the expense of long term growth and survivability, we put the world at risk.

Not just the economy or our society or the polar bears ... the world.

(PAUSE)

If business doesn't fulfill these needs, who will?

The answer is, nobody. Nobody else can.

If you haven't read Walter Isaacson's book, *The Innovators*, I recommend it. It shows how our technological world was created by a vibrant partnership between government agencies, academia and the business community.

They were all engaged in creating something totally new, something that changed our world. And we all benefited from it.

The businesses that were part of that revolution—Apple, Microsoft, Intel, Cisco and hundreds of others—were interested in the bottom line, but that's not what drove them.

They were driven by the idea that they could change the world if they could get a computer on every desk.

That was the passion that kept them up at night working on solutions. And that passion made billions and billions of dollars.

The world wants us to have the same passion now. What if we went after this idea: that business can solve the problems of poverty, hunger, ignorance and fear?

That we can work with government agencies and academia and NGOs bring everyone into the global economy as full participants?

And that we can do that not as charity but as our business model? Because business that are social, serviceable and sustainable are delivering better results to the bottom line.

In fact, they're delivering a triple bottom line: they're better for profits, better for people and better for polar bears.

And here's the thing: IF you can pivot to a new business model that is social, serviceful AND sustainable...

...the world will beat a path to your door.

WINNER: PHILOSOPHY AND/OR RELIGION

"Search"

Written and delivered by Jeffrey Flint,
President, Flint Speechwriting



Delivered at Crownmaster Speech Club,
San Francisco, Dec. 21, 2017

Before Google, there were humans. And they were searching.

Much of what humans have done, and do, is "Search". We search for food. We search for a house. We search for a job. We search for a mate. We search for meaning. Food, House, Job, Mate, Meaning. And when we cannot find, we yearn. Humans yearn. Perhaps a better name for "Google" is "yearn".

We humans, we search, because mostly we do not know what we want until we see it. We want the thing when we see it, but without the seeing, we search. When we tire of the search, we settle. And when we settle we yearn. Remember the list: food, house, job, mate, meaning. I am sure there is at least one item on that list, for each of

you here, for which you've settled, and for which you yearn.

Furthermore, what we see, what we want, is not what we get. There is the dating, and then there is the marriage. There is the interview, and then there is the job. There is the promise of the bud, and then there is the reality of the bloom. We search for the promise, we get the bloom. We live the marriage. We live the job. We live the bloom. The bud is an illusion.

Think about your first apartment search. Unbeknownst to you, you have this picture of the perfect place in your mind, so that if you see it, you'll want it. Even though you do not know what you want, even though you cannot visualize what you want, you'll want it when you see it. You walk the streets

and look for signs in windows. You get calls from friends. You go on line. You are conducting here what is known as a random search, the random search of a beginner. You have very little strategy.

The first place you visit does not have that feeling of perfection. It's fine, it is just not what you want. The kitchen is too square and you'd like more light.

The second place you visit is also not right, no place to put the couch. Neither is the third, nor the fourth. You begin to tire of the search and you tell yourself, "There must be an easier way."

The strategy phase begins.

Strategies work because they reduce the number of items that can be searched; that is, they reduce the size of the search space. But strategies fail

because they remove possibility. Only looking for apartments in Sacramento means you will never live in Paris, but only looking in Sacramento saves a lot of time.

In other words, a search strategy changes the character of what is possible, in trade for the prospect of saving time. For example, hiring a realtor would likely speed up your search, but it would also change the character of the apartments you entertain. Most realtors would consider to show you any available apartment in Sacramento, but an unseemly realtor may restrict his search to the landlords he personally knows, or to apartments he owns himself.

How a strategy reduces the search space to change the character of what is possible is called, in this talk, the strategy's morality. That's right, "morality". The aim of this talk is to convince you that the character by which we conduct the searches of our lives, to resolve our yearning, is equivalent to our conventional notion of morality; meaning, that what we know as "immorality" is equivalent to not conducting a moral search. It makes sense that if each act of our lives is consumed with the search for Food, House, Job, Mate, Meaning, then that how we conduct these searches is equivalent to how we conduct our lives, is equivalent to our morality. And from there, a theory of God emerges.

So let's get started.

The morality of a search strategy, or how a search strategy changes the character of the search, is defined in this talk as the probability of the search's success, with "success" defined as "works well when lived."

That is, the search that delivers results that, when lived, works best, is more moral than the results that, when lived, works least. Remember, though, that what is being searched for is the bud, and what is being lived is the bloom. The morality of the search for the bud can only be determined by living the bloom. You have to live the choice to determine its morality.

So, how can it be possible to know what is the most moral search strategy

if one needs to live it to know? Add to that, we humans do not know for who or for what we are searching until we see it. We simply know not what we do. We want to know the force of our actions. But we do not. So we yearn. So, again, how can it be possible to know what is the most moral search strategy?

The first answer is to look at search strategies that have worked well already. The world's great moral traditions are here because they worked. Whether it be Taoism, Western Civilization, or Hinduism, they are here because they worked. The great moral traditions are here because they have constrained the search space in such a way as to produce results that usually work, when lived. Their existence today is proof of that.

Take the example of finding a mate. Some people go to bars. Some people join clubs. Or date at work. Or they have their families arrange a meeting. Which strategy is more moral? Hard to say, for all of these strategies have worked for a long time. You might have an opinion which is best. But, what about the strategy of dating your siblings? Most people would say that that strategy is immoral. It is also not moral as a search. Why? The strategy of dating your sibling does not work well, when lived. That is, inbreeding does not work well, when lived. We know now the genetic reasons why inbreeding is a faulty search strategy, but the world's great moral traditions had already discovered inbreeding's immorality by trial-and-error over time. Inbreeding overly limits the search so that the probability of success, when lived, is less than the other strategies. That is, not a moral search!

Another example is the morality of stealing and killing. Most moral traditions counsel people to not steal or kill while searching. Why is that? In one way, if I am searching for food, and I like your food, it is really efficient for me to kill you and take your food. But what happens over time, in the long run, when lived? Society loses the ability to produce food because the people who have the food or know how to get

it get killed or hide. The supply of food declines and the population shrinks. Not a successful outcome, when lived. On the other hand, if people search for their food without killing each other to get it, the search will be enhanced to discover new ways to get food, like farming, since having more food will not expose people to murder. Technological progress is often a sign of a successful and therefore moral search because technological progress lowers the barriers of success so that others can succeed. Technological progress makes the search easier.

A second sign of a moral search strategy, is a capacity to try a greater number of searches. It is useful here to think of a search attempt as a "trial" or as an "experiment." One search strategy is usually more moral than another search strategy if it has a capacity to search for more trials, and thereby conduct more experiments, than another. This makes intuitive sense. It makes sense that as more things are tried that there will be more successes.

For example, one government is more moral than another government if its rules for searching allow more experimentation by its people, allow more trials by its people, than the other government. A big reason for the success of the United States is that its culture and laws permit the freedom to try new things, to experiment. There are fifty states, with each of them defining government policy a little differently. Those are 50 experiments being conducted in parallel. But the experimentation is not just in public policy. People are free to try out new ideas in business and academia too. Each new business opened is a trial. That new restaurant that just opened down the street from you is an experiment. The faster the rate at which new businesses are tried improve the chances that one of them will be the next Google. But, that is not to say a failed business is not a help. When that new business is not a success, society still has benefited from the attempt, because now others in the search know not to go down that same path. Failure is important feedback

when searching. Ideas that fail, whether they be for public policy or for business or for academics, benefit everyone because they were tried, because they were lived. Ironically, a high number of failures is a trait of a moral search strategy, because a high number of failures usually indicates a high number of trials tried.

And finally, the example of the United States suggests another common characteristic of a moral search, and that is freedom. In general, a more moral search allows more possibility in its results than a less moral search. Ideally, in fact, all possibilities are reachable. The randomness of the beginner is needed. I said earlier that searching for an apartment only in Sacramento will prohibit finding an apartment in Paris. A more moral version of that search would emphasize searching in Sacramento, but allow searching anywhere, including Paris. We see that same allowing of possibility in the morality of killing. We mostly do not allow the killing of another human being, but most people will say that under the right circumstances, killing is allowed. Self-defense is an example, war is another, and there are others.

The three metrics of a moral search just explored, namely, the degree of

homage to what has worked in the past, the rate at which trials can be produced, and the extent of possibility, can be used to measure the relative morality of the actions of both people and institutions. But why should we trust these metrics? How do we know they will work, when lived?

We can trust these metrics because we trust life. These metrics came from studying the search character of the best searcher there is, life itself. Life itself has lived enough searches to know.

Life itself certainly uses what has worked in the past. We humans, and all of life, are constructed with what has worked. Each encounter with danger, each lucky find, each right or wrong turn conspired to bring us to now. We are here because we work. Yeast and humans share 50% of their genome. Humans are constructed with yeast because yeast works.

And look at the variety and quantity of life on the planet today and in the fossil record. The quantity suggests life is good at producing trials; the variety suggests the freedom of life's search. Each species an experiment. Each individual animal or plant, dog, or iris, a trial. Each of you here is a trial, a search, an attempt. Good Luck. There are 1800 trillion pounds of bacteria on

this planet. That is a lot of searching that is happening with each of those bacteria making their way in the world.

So life itself is the most effective, and therefore the most moral, search methodologist we know about, and we'd be wise to imitate her methods. Life itself defines morality.

But, but, but. The big question remains.

For who or for what is life searching? The frenetic genetic search. It is beautiful. It is elegant. It is also mysterious. For who or for what? Life has certainly already found its share of Food, House, Job, and Mate.

We can go further. Since life is a part of the universe, evolved by the universe, a search engine for the universe, for who or for what is the universe searching?

As promised, a theory of God becomes possible.

"God is that which searches."

But. We have evidence that if it is God who is doing the searching, God has not yet found for who or for what God is searching. After all, we ourselves are evidence of a search in progress.

So we are left with.

"God is that which yearns."

God yearns.

Thank you.

WINNER: RHETORIC AND COMMUNICATION

"Speechwriting: An Anglo-American Perspective"

Written and delivered by Hal Gordon,
Freelance Speechwriter



Delivered at the British Consulate General,
Houston, March 22, 2017

In the "Adventure of the Noble Bachelor"—one of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's Sherlock Holmes stories—the great detective says this to an American visitor to England:

"It is always a joy to meet an American, Mr. Moulton ... For I am one of those who believe that the folly of a monarch and the blundering of a minister in far-gone years will not prevent our children from being some day citizens of the same world-wide

country under a flag which shall be a quartering of the Union Jack with the Stars and Stripes."

Well, we have still not seen the quartering of the Union Jack with the Stars and Stripes.

But that does not change the fact that Anglo-American relations are of vital importance—to Britain and America, and I daresay to the world at large.

In the aftermath of Brexit and the election of Donald Trump, we are

gathered at a very dramatic juncture in the history Anglo-American relations.

In particular, there is the prospect of a major new bilateral trade agreement between Britain and America. The U.S. is Britain's second-largest trading partner—after Germany.

The U.K. is America's seventh-largest trading partner overall, and first-largest trading partner in services. Britain is also America's largest direct investor. Roughly one million Ameri-

can jobs depend on British companies based in America.

So it was not a coincidence that the Prime Minister Teresa May was the first foreign leader to meet with President Trump after he took office in January.

Good relations between Britain and America are as important now as they ever were.

Good relations depend on good communications.

That's why your work is important—and that's why we're here today.

I'm told that most of you are American—some are British. I understand that most of you are press and PR officers at British consulates in the U.S., and some of you are based in Canada and Mexico.

I'm also told that Sophie Adelman—who invited me to speak to you today—is the only fulltime speechwriter in your network.

The rest of you write speeches and op/eds for your respective Consul Generals as part of your other duties.

In other words, you are all writers—and, I'm sure, good writers—but you are not full-time speechwriters.

So Sophie wanted me to come and share with you some of the tricks I've learned in my over 30 years as a professional speechwriter.

I can tell you that I am both pleased and honored to do so. I've been an Anglophile ever since I was a small boy, enchanted by the King Arthur stories.

I studied in England when I was in college. I have close friends there, and I've been back to visit a number of times.

So I'm very proud to be asked to contribute—even in a small way—to furthering Anglo-American relations.

Let's to business, then.

We've got an hour. I propose to speak for about half that time, and then open the floor to you. At that point, you'll be free to ask me anything you want, whether it's included in my talk or not.

To begin: What makes a speech different from other forms of writing—like a press release or an op/ed?

Is a speech simply a matter of talking?

Years ago, I heard one of President Clinton's speechwriters give a speech. He said something about working with Bill Clinton that bothered me at the time, and has bothered me ever since.

He said that Mr. Clinton told him that he wanted to have "conversations" with his audiences.

As Mr. Clinton put it: "I don't want to speak to people, I want to talk to them."

Now, on the surface, that sounds admirable.

Mr. Clinton wanted to "talk" to people—to communicate with them in plain language, without any artifice or rhetorical devices.

But is this really what we want from our leaders?

I mean, if it's "talk" you want, you can go to the barber shop, right?

By and large, "talk" is not what people expect from a leader—or from any speaker for that matter.

Imagine Lincoln at Gettysburg, deciding that he wanted to "talk" to the people. Suppose he had said, "Eighty-seven years ago, a bunch of really cool guys got together to make a country. This country was going to be a place founded on freedom where everybody would be equal..."

What did Lincoln actually say?

Or imagine if 50-some years ago, John F. Kennedy had decided that he wanted to "talk" to the American people on the occasion of his swearing in as their President.

Suppose he had said, "Dudes—ya can't just take from America. Ya gotta, like, give something back once in while, ya know?"

What did John Kennedy actually say?

Were Lincoln and Kennedy insincere because they used rhetorical devices rather than just "talking" to their audiences?

No. On the contrary, they believed deeply in what they were saying. They believed so much in their message that they wanted to make it meaningful and memorable to their audiences.

So Lincoln began the Gettysburg Address with an archaic expression like

"fourscore"—which was old-fashioned even 1863. It's the language of the King James Bible.

Kennedy used a rhetorical device called "antithesis"—which means the balancing of contrasting ideas: "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country."

In other words, they used rhetoric—which is the art of using language effectively and persuasively.

And so did Bill Clinton—regardless of what he told his speechwriters. If you read his major presidential addresses, you'll see this.

Now some of you may say, what about Donald Trump? All he does is talk to people—and a lot of the time he doesn't even talk in complete sentences.

OK, fair point. But look at his inaugural address. Even better—look at his first speech to Congress. That's easily the best speech he's given so far. Even Donald Trump uses rhetoric.

I will come back to that later.

What about this occasion? Suppose I just talked to you. Suppose I turned up today prepared to do nothing more than reel off a few war stories from my speechwriting career?

I could have done that—but I think you deserve better.

In fact I think that if an occasion is worth a speech at all, it's a time for speaking and not just "talking"

So, ladies and gentleman, I am here to speak to you today. I'm here to share with you some of the secrets of the art of speechwriting.

Let me begin by demystifying rhetoric.

The art of rhetoric began in ancient Greece. Why Greece?

Probably, it was because there were no lawyers in ancient Greece. If you sued someone, or were sued yourself (and the Greeks were apparently as litigious as we are) you had to plead your own case in court.

So it is not surprising that the first schools of rhetoric began in Greece—and the first textbooks on rhetoric were written in Greek.

The greatest of these textbooks was Aristotle's *On Rhetoric*.

Aristotle said that there were three ways by which a speaker could move an audience: ethos, logos, and pathos.

Logos and pathos are easy to understand. Logos is logic, and pathos is emotion.

Ethos is harder to explain. Essentially, ethos means building a bond with the audience, so that the audience will trust the speaker and be receptive to the speaker's message.

I'm going to give you two examples, about 60 years apart, of how two very different British prime ministers used ethos when they addressed a joint session of the U.S. Congress.

The first example is Winston Churchill addressing Congress on December 26, 1941, just after America entered the Second World War.

Churchill reminded his audience that his mother had been American. And then he said: "I cannot help reflecting that if my father had been American and my mother British instead of the other way around, I might have got here on my own."

You can track down the video of Churchill's speech on YouTube, and see for yourselves the laughter and the warm feelings that this personal remark generated.

The second example is Tony Blair, addressing a joint session of Congress on July 17, 2003—after the U.S. and Britain had been allies in the war the overthrew Saddam Hussein.

Mr. Blair also shared something personal. He said: "My middle son was studying 18th century history and the American War of Independence ... and he said to me the other day ... 'You know, Lord North, Dad? He was the British prime minister who lost us America. So just think ... however many mistakes you'll make ... you'll never make one that bad.'"

At the risk of belaboring the point, I'll give one more example of ethos.

On October 14 of 2010, Sir Nigel Sheinwald, then Britain's ambassador to the U.S., gave a speech in Houston. It was a speech that was obviously the product of some very extensive research by the British Embassy staff.

Sir Nigel began with a brief recap of relations between Britain and Texas. He pointed out that 26 of the Alamo's heroic defenders had been born in the British Isles.

Then he said that when Texas won its independence from Mexico and became a republic, Britain was one of the few nations to recognize the short-lived Texas Republic that lasted from 1836 to 1845.

He added there is a plaque in London today, marking the building that housed the Embassy of Texas for those nine years.

Sir Nigel explained that the plaque is difficult to spot because it's placed quite high on the wall.

"I understand," he continued with the hint of a smile, that "this is less a reflection of the height of the average Texan ... and more to do with the fact that a number of Texas tourists ... so overcome with pride at finding their Embassy ... tried to take the plaque home as a memento."

I was sitting in the audience, and I can tell you how we Texans roared at that.

Ethos, logos and pathos can also be used in combination.

Lyman Beecher, the great 19th Century Presbyterian minister, once put it this way. He said, "Eloquence is logic on fire."

How do we set our speeches on fire? What are some of the trade secrets I promised you?

For starters: Writing for the ear is very different than writing for the eye.

It's a lot more difficult.

It's harder to process information through your ears than through your eyes. So you have to make it as easy on your listeners as you can.

You want to keep your speech simple; you don't want to crowd too much data into a single speech.

I'm going to digress for a moment and return to Churchill.

It is fairly well known that Churchill had an American mother.

What is very little known is that Churchill learned the art of rhetoric from an Irish-American politician

named William Bourke Cockran.

Two years ago, at Cambridge University, I gave a talk on the Churchill-Cockran connection. I called it, "The Man Who Made Winston Churchill." I did not exaggerate.

To the end of his life, Churchill revered Cockran. If you read the full text of Churchill's "Iron Curtain" speech—which he gave in 1946—you will find a warm tribute to Cockran, even though Cockran by then had been dead over 20 years.

Cockran was an Irish immigrant who became a brilliant trial lawyer and a member of Congress.

Cockran told Churchill that the key to making a speech or addressing a jury was this: "Make one simple bold point and keep pounding on it with many illustrations and examples."

Churchill not only took this advice to heart, he would pass it on to other young, up-and-coming parliamentarians who were struggling to find their own voices.

When Harold Macmillan, the future prime minister, gave his first speech to the House of Commons in 1923, he asked Churchill for his opinion.

Churchill replied, "Harold, everyone in the gallery is saying, 'Young Macmillan's giving his maiden address.' Then they ask, 'What's it about?' And Harold ... if you can't say in one sentence what the speech is about, it is not worth giving."

So—keep it simple.

Also, don't be afraid to repeat. You want to repeat to make sure that the audience gets your message, and you want to repeat for emphasis, to help drive your point home.

Think of Dr. Martin Luther King's "I have a dream" speech. "I have a dream..." repeated over and over. And the words don't lose their power through repetition—they gain.

What else about writing for the ear?

You want to illustrate. You want to make facts and figures come alive.

You've all heard the expression, "a picture is worth a thousand words." Or, "Do I have to draw you a picture?"

Well, yes, actually you do. One of the best ways of making a point in a speech is by drawing a picture with words.

I'll give you an example from an American president not noted for his skills as a speaker—Dwight Eisenhower.

Here is Eisenhower in 1953, talking about the cost of the arms race with Russia:

"The cost of one modern heavy bomber is this:

"A modern brick school in more than 30 cities.

"It is two electric power plants, each serving a town of 60,000 population.

"It is two fine, fully-equipped hospitals.

"It is some 50 miles of concrete highway.

"We pay for a single fighter plane with half a million bushels of wheat.

"We pay for a single destroyer with new homes that could have housed more than 8,000 people.

"This is not a way of life in any true sense. Under the cloud of threatening war, it is humanity hanging from a cross of iron."

Now the image of humanity hanging from a cross of iron is a powerful one—it's a sound bite—but it is even more powerful coming at the end of that series of word pictures.

So be sparing with the use of facts and figures, and dramatize them whenever you can.

At the very least, do not say "This year, 33.33 percent of all Americans will suffer from hangnail." Say instead, "This year alone, one out of every three Americans will reach for a pair of shears to trim a pesky hangnail." Do you see the difference?

You also want to avoid using the passive voice.

When Winston Churchill (Churchill again) rallied the British people after Dunkirk during World War II, he said: "We shall fight on the beaches ..."

Suppose he had said: "Hostilities will be commenced along the coastal perimeters."

If he had, I might be giving this talk in German.

So, do not say, "It is expected that..." "It is to be hoped that ..." or "It is desirable that ..."

Say: We expect, we hope, we want.

Another thing about writing for the ear is that we want the sound and the rhythm of the words to be pleasing to our listeners' ears.

I'm going to give you an example from George Orwell's marvelous little essay, "Politics and the English Language."

As one example of good English, Orwell offers a passage from the King James Bible. It's from Ecclesiastes:

"I returned, and saw under the sun, that the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, neither yet bread to the wise, nor yet riches to men of skill; but time and chance happeneth to them all."

And then Orwell proceeds to translate this passage of good English into what he calls "modern English of the worst sort." Listen to this:

"Objective consideration of contemporary phenomena compels the conclusion that success or failure in competitive activities exhibits no tendency to be commensurate with innate capacity, but that a considerable element of the unpredictable must invariably be taken into account."

You've lost your audience before you're halfway through a snorer like that!

Something else. Let's go back to the King James Version—and good English.

Notice the rhythm of each clause in that passage from Ecclesiastes: "the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, neither yet bread to the wise, nor yet riches to men of understanding...."

Notice that every clause but one ends with a single-syllable word. And in the case of the one exception—understanding—the beat falls on the last syllable. This is not by accident.

The preacher is literally pounding the message home: "not to the swift, not to the strong, not to the wise, but time and chance happeneth to them all."

Let me make an aside here on the King James Bible. The King James Bible was intended to be read aloud because most people in 17th Century England were illiterate. So when the scholars who worked on this version of the Bible finished translating a passage, what do you think they did? They read it aloud.

That was the acid test. If it sounded right, it was right.

Another way you make a speech sparkle is through the use of alliteration.

You're all writers—what is alliteration? It is repeating the same consonant for dramatic impact.

Consider Abraham Lincoln's second inaugural address: "Fondly we do hope, fervently we do pray, that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away."

Whenever I need a recent example of alliteration, it's the easiest thing in the world to find one. I just go to the White House website and look up the most recent major speech given by the president. And—regardless of who is president at the time—I always find alliteration.

Even when the president is Donald Trump.

Earlier, I mentioned President Trump's speech to Congress in January. He used alliteration—or at least his speechwriter did. I quote:

"I believe strongly in free trade but it also has to be fair trade."

Again: "Every hurting family can find healing and hope."

And again: "We have seen the war and the destruction that have ravaged and raged throughout the world."

How do you learn the art of speechwriting? I would say that the best way is to study the best models.

That means studying great speeches, but I think it also means studying great plays—because great plays are full of great speeches.

Plays are instructive in another way as well.

In writing a play, you have to cut out every line that doesn't move the action of the play forward. In writing a speech, you have to cut out every line

that doesn't advance the point you are trying to make.

Does that mean that when you speak you should stick to the facts? That you should avoid using quotes, poetry, jokes or stories? Not at all. Look at how often I've resorted to quotes and stories in my remarks to you.

But it does mean that if you make use of quotes, poetry, jokes or stories you make very sure that they will reinforce the point you are trying to make—and not distract the audience.

Actually, stories can be a great way of making a point in a speech.

Most of the teachings of Jesus have come down to us in the form of parables—stories. Most great speakers have been great story-tellers.

Abraham Lincoln was a great story-teller.

So was Ronald Reagan. Even Winston Churchill was a story-teller, although we don't usually associate him with stories.

Once, just before World War II, Churchill was making the case for spending more on the Royal Air Force.

He made all the predictable arguments about how Britain was being outspent by Nazi Germany, and the danger that this imbalance posed.

He then drove his point home by telling a story.

A man got telegram informing him that his mother-in-law had died while vacationing in South America. What arrangements did he prefer? He wired back: "Embalm, cremate, and bury. Take no chances!"

One last piece of advice. And this applies to other forms of writing as well as to speechwriting:

Save something good for the end.

When you finish your speech, you want to do two things. First, you want to signal your audience that the speaker is coming to the end, so they'll be ready to applaud. And you don't want to do that by saying something as trite as "In conclusion..."

Second, you have to give the audience a reason to applaud. You don't want them to applaud because they feel they have to—or worse, because they feel sorry for the speaker.

You want them to applaud because they mean it.

To do that, you have to give them a reason to applaud.

I'm going to give you one of the best examples I know of how to end a speech. The speech is Gen. Douglas MacArthur's "Duty, Honor, Country" speech which he gave at West Point in 1962.

Gen. MacArthur was then 82 years old—and a national hero. He knew, and his audience knew, that this would be his last address to the West Point cadet corps. So at the end of his speech, he milked the drama of the occasion for all it was worth.

I'm going to read the ending. And I'm going to ask you to note two things: First, note the subtle way that Gen. MacArthur lets the audience know that he is drawing to a close.

Second, once he signals that he's coming to a close, note how with each

line that follows he ratchets up the emotional level another notch, until the tension is wound so tight that when he ends the speech the audience virtually has to applaud to relieve the emotional strain.

Here is Gen MacArthur:

"The shadows are lengthening for me. The twilight is here. My days of old have vanished, tone and tint. They have gone glimmering through the dreams of things that were. Their memory is one of wondrous beauty, watered by tears, and coaxed and caressed by the smiles of yesterday. I listen vainly, but with thirsty ears, for the witching melody of faint bugles blowing reveille, of far drums beating the long roll. In my dreams I hear again the crash of guns, the rattle of musketry, the strange, mournful mutter of the battlefield.

"But in the evening of my memory, always I come back to West Point.

"Always there echoes and re-echoes: Duty, Honor, Country.

"Today marks my final roll call with you, but I want you to know that when I cross the river my last conscious thoughts will be of The Corps, and The Corps, and The Corps.

"I bid you farewell."

Again, MacArthur had wound the audience so tight that they had to applaud to relieve the tension.

Well, I've given you the signal that my own speech is at an end.

Thank you for your attention. I'll be happy to take your questions.

WINNER: TECHNOLOGY

"Living in the Glass Age"

Written by Judith Navoy for Dr. Jeffrey W. Evenson,
Vice President and Chief Strategy Officer, Corning Incorporated



Delivered via video at International Biennale of Glass,
Sofia, Bulgaria, Sept. 30, 2017

Hello. I'm Jeff Evenson, and I'm honored to participate at the International Biennale of Glass and speak with you about a topic I'm passionate about.

I'm Senior Vice President and Chief Strategy Officer for Corning Incorporated, which is headquartered in Corning, New York. I'm also Chairman of the Corning Museum of Glass. These positions give me a unique perspective on glass from both a technology and an artistic perspective.

I think most of you are familiar with the Corning Museum of Glass. For those of you who aren't familiar with Corning Incorporated, we are a world leader in glass science and related capabilities.

For 165 years, we've applied our expertise in advanced glass, ceramics, and optical physics to solve tough technology challenges and transform industries.

Our innovations include the first glass bulbs for Thomas Edison's electric light, the substrates at the heart of catalytic converters, and the first low-loss optical fiber. We have a long track record of developing life-changing technologies. But I'm not here to talk about my company. Today, I'd like to talk about the life-changing material at the center of this event, and at the center of the work we do at Corning.

Glass is arguably one of the most transformative materials of all time. And today, it's changing the game for a broad range of industries including consumer electronics, telecommunications, life sciences, architecture, transportation, energy, and more.

I'd like to start by describing the properties that make glass such an extraordinary material. Next, I'll review some of the revolutions that glass has spawned, and explain why I believe we

only recently entered the Glass Age. I'll end my prepared remarks with some examples of new glass-based technologies that Corning and other innovators are bringing to life.

So, what is glass?

At its core, glass is quite simple. It consists mainly of silica, in the form of sand. But glass is not a single material—it is a diverse family of materials. By adding different elements, you can dramatically change its properties—and thereby tune its capabilities for different applications.

Let's talk about some of the inherent and achievable properties that make glass so special.

I'm sure you already appreciate its aesthetic properties. For more than 3000 years, artists have used glass because of how it forms, how it feels, how it handles light, and how it takes on color.

But glass is also remarkable because of its technical attributes.

No one understood that better than Stanislav Libensky and Jaroslava Brychtova, who set new artistic and technical directions for glass art and industry in the Czech Republic and, ultimately, for glass artists around the world.

From new methods for casting architectural glass... to the spectacular optical effects they created by varying the density of the glass and modulating the filtration of light... to the sense of interior volume they produced from the use of thick cast glass... They always balanced art and technique in their work, and understood that the improvement of technical skills could create new possibilities for artists.

Similarly, at Corning, we believe that an understanding of artistic principles can create new possibilities for technology. I'll return to that thought in a minute. But first, I want to share

some examples of the technical properties of glass that may surprise you.

For example, glass is one of the world's most stable and enduring engineering materials.

Silica glasses get their stability from a continuous network of silicon-oxygen bonds. These bonds remain intact from the time the component sand is mined through the life cycle of the material.

That's why glass objects endure for centuries. In contrast, metals corrode, and plastics disintegrate and generate toxic chemicals when they burn.

Let's consider an example.

Have any of you heard people say that glass windows in medieval cathedrals are slightly thicker at the bottom than at the top because of relaxation over the centuries? The reality is, it would take 20 trillion times the age of the earth for gravity to create a visible change in the thickness of a glass window.

Next, glass is virtually impermeable. It's been used for thousands of years as a container because of its effectiveness at protecting contents from contamination by the surrounding environment. A molecule of oxygen takes about two weeks to pass through a piece of high-tech plastic one-millimeter thick. That same oxygen molecule would take 10 quintillion years to pass through one millimeter of silica glass! Now, Corning's glass scientists are sticklers for precision. But even our most senior glass fellow was comfortable rounding that number to "never."

Glass also features unprecedented transparency, which makes it uniquely effective for optical and RF transmission. The glass used for optical fiber is more than 30 times as transparent as the purest water and only about 1% less transmissive than air on a clear day. If the ocean were made of the

glass used in optical fiber, you would be able to clearly see the bottom from every point on its surface.

And despite its reputation for being fragile, glass can be engineered to be incredibly strong and damage resistant. Scientists estimate glass's theoretical strength at more than 15 Gigapascals. Now, I realize there may be a few people in the audience who don't measure things in Pascals. So I have an analogy that might help.

Imagine a scale that measures the pressure under an elephant's foot. To get this scale to read one Gigapascal, you would need to stack 10,000 elephants on top of each other. Now, since I'm not there in person, I'm unable to stack 10,000 elephants for you, so I won't be demonstrating this point today. But later in my talk, I will give you a different demonstration of how strong glass can be.

Finally, glass is incredibly versatile, which creates tremendous possibilities from both an artistic and an engineering perspective. Artists can mold, cast, blow, or draw glass to create the desired shape, because its viscosity decreases in a smooth and continuous manner with increasing temperature, unlike materials that have abrupt transitions from solid to liquid or gas.

And as I noted earlier, scientists and engineers can create a nearly infinite range of new glasses by combining silica with different elements from the Periodic Table. To date, scientists have added about 50 other elements to silica glass to create unique compositions. But we're just getting started.

That brings us to the end of the first section of my remarks. I've described what glass is, and illustrated some of the features that make it really cool. And with capabilities like that, it's not surprising that glass has already had a profound impact on the world.

The development of spectacles in the 13th century allowed monks to copy and study religious texts and helped popularize reading following the invention of the printing press.

The development of crown glass in the 14th century allowed people to

incorporate windows into their homes to let in light, while keeping out cold, wind, and rain.

The invention of the telescope in the early 17th century expanded our understanding of the universe in which we live.

The development of the microscope enabled the discovery of the cell, bacteria, and viruses, leading to life-saving vaccines and antibiotics.

Glass mirrors led to the formal use of linear perspective during the Renaissance...

and encouraged artists such as Rembrandt to paint self-portraits.

The development of tempered glass in the early 1900s led to safer military gear and automotive windshields.

Glass lenses and picture tubes created major shifts in popular culture by enabling photography, motion pictures, and television.

And the invention of low-loss optical fiber in 1970 created the backbone of the Internet and ushered in a communications revolution.

I think you'll agree that's a pretty impressive list. In light of glass's long history and profound impact on the world already, why do we believe we are living in the Glass Age today?

One reason is the ubiquity of glass and its central role in our day-to-day lives. We interact with glass screens on our computers and smart phones, take pictures through glass lenses, transmit and receive information via glass fibers, protect materials in glass covers and containers, and incorporate decorative and functional glass elements into our homes.

But the main reason I believe this is the Glass Age is because of the journey we've made from magic to science... and from science back to magic. Let me explain.

For centuries, the Lycurgus Cup confounded observers with its mysterious ability to appear jade-green when lit from the front and ruby-red when lit from the inside. The cup was created in the 4th century, but people didn't understand until relatively recently that the effect was caused by

the presence of microscopic silver and gold particles.

When monks used early spectacles as reading aids, they didn't understand how the eye refracts light and focuses images.

When Murano glassmakers created extraordinarily clear crystal in the 15th century by melting river stones with plant ash, they almost certainly didn't understand how silica interacted with sodium and manganese.

People believed that magic was behind all these creations.

Today, we've replaced magic with science.

We understand how different formulation and fabrication techniques determine the atomic state and structure of a glass. That allows us to precisely control its mechanical, thermal and optical properties. Our understanding of glass physics and chemistry also reduces our dependence on serendipity and time-consuming trial-and-error experimentation. We now use sophisticated modeling techniques to predict how a glass will behave. This knowledge has dramatically accelerated the design and development of new industrial glasses.

In the past ten years alone, glass scientists have unleashed capabilities that we could only dream of a few decades ago. [As I noted in the beginning of my remarks, Corning has a 165-year history of glass innovations; yet some of our most recent breakthroughs have happened in relatively quick succession.

In the past decade, Corning scientists have developed chemically strengthened glass that can withstand the impact of a baseball travelling at more than 56 kilometers per hour.

Let's take a look.

That's conventional soda-lime glass on the left and Corning's chemically strengthened Gorilla glass on the right. Both are 1 millimeter thick. Quite a difference, huh?

We've also created flexible glass that is slimmer than a dollar bill.

Did you ever think you'd see glass that could do this?

And we've developed antimicrobial glass that suppresses the growth of mold, mildew, fungi, and bacteria.

Of course, we're not the only ones forging new frontiers in glass.

For example, the VTT Technical Research Centre of Finland has created smart lenses that use optical light-guides to display large, high-quality images that augment reality.

And scientists at Mo-Sci Corporation in Missouri have developed bioactive glasses that heal flesh wounds by stimulating the body's natural defenses. Pretty cool, huh?

The futurist Arthur C. Clark famously remarked, "Any sufficiently advanced technology is indistinguishable from magic." And I think the latest glass innovations are proving his point.

So, let's bring it closer to home, and talk about some glass innovations that are likely to impact your lives in the near future.

I assume many of you are interested in architecture.

Glass, of course, has played an important role in architecture historically. I don't think any of us can imagine our homes without windows. And the architect Le Corbusier once called glass "the most miraculous means of restoring the law of the sun."

But glass has also been criticized for its limits. Let's consider a few. We talked about transparency earlier. Of course, glass can run the gamut from transparent to opaque. But the opacity is generally fixed.

Today, a company named View is changing that with electrochromic windows that transition from transparent to opaque on demand. This allows us to eliminate the use of shades. More importantly, it allows us to continuously experience all the benefits of windows and natural light such as greater productivity in workplaces and healthier environments in hospitals, while increasing our comfort and reducing energy consumption.

Another limitation on glass as an architectural component has been its acoustic properties—specifically, the unwanted reflection of sounds.

We've developed microperforated glass panels that absorb sound and eliminate echo.

The front pane has tiny holes in it; The back pane does not. Together, they form a resonant cavity that dissipates energy as air passes in and out of the holes. Absorption is controlled by the hole shape, cavity spacing, and hole pattern.

Lastly, a common complaint about glass—and many other construction and design materials—is the expense of transporting it and the need to process it at specialized facilities. Remember that ultra slim, flexible glass I showed you a moment ago? That glass has multiple applications for interior design, including backsplashes, modular wall panels, or as a laminate over materials like stainless steel to make them scratch resistant and easier to clean.

The laminates are light weight, which reduces shipping costs, but they're also extremely durable. And you can use ordinary construction tools like wet saws to cut the glass on-site.

That means no more waiting for custom orders. Let's take a look.

Here you're seeing a sheet of ultra-slim glass that has been laminated to stainless steel.

As you can see, the glass does not shatter when cut.

Let's look at a few more examples of what it means to be living in the Glass Age.

Infotainment walls are dissolving the boundaries between the real and the virtual by integrating digital content, social networking, and home and office management capabilities.

Interactive retail windows are bridging the gap between online shopping and brick & mortar stores, while digital fitting rooms allow customers to experiment virtually.

Smart hubs are becoming a reality in the home, allowing you to control appliances, manage calendars, and display images on customizable interfaces.

And cars are becoming cleaner, safer, and more connected, thanks to glass that is lightweight, damage-resistant, and optimized for touch technology.

Now, those are some of the applications you're likely to see and experience in the very near future. But there are also many exciting glass developments going on behind the scenes to solve some of our world's toughest problems.

As we strive to meet the needs of an aging population, glass enables new tools for biomedical discovery and drug delivery. As we try to make our environment greener, glass enables solar technologies to provide cleaner energy. As we continue to improve the way we interact with the world and each other, glass can enable communications with unlimited bandwidth. And as we dissolve the boundaries between the physical and virtual world, glass can enable new display technologies for augmented and virtual reality.

Ultimately, glass is enabling a world with cleaner air, more effective medicine, richer entertainment experiences, and more efficient communication. And I think that's a world we all want.

So what will it take to realize the potential of The Glass Age? Some of the answers won't surprise you.

Partnerships are vital. This is something that Libensky and Brychtova understood extremely well. Theirs, of course, is one of the most enduring and successful artistic partnerships of the last century. But they also found a way to work effectively within significant geopolitical constraints by partnering with other artists, educators, and industry. As a result, they created opportunities that would not have been possible working in isolation.

We need to build bridges in the global glass community between corporations, universities, and professional associations. We need faculty and mentors that create excitement about glass technologies to ensure a strong pipeline of students interested in pursuing glass research. And we need to create collaborations with hardware companies and software developers; information and entertainment content providers; health and human services providers; artists and designers; retailers and more.

We need a healthy supply of funding from government agencies and the

private sector, and we need to make sure that the distribution of funding and research is weighted toward the fields that offer the greatest benefits to society. But we need to balance applied research with exploratory research and to allow scientists the opportunity for self-directed projects, because that can lead to the biggest breakthroughs.

But perhaps the greatest challenge is one that you can help us with. We're pretty good at the technology side of things. But in many ways, our story is still missing the human case.

Earlier in my remarks, I mentioned some of the aesthetic properties of

glass—the way it forms, feels, handles light, and takes on color. Those features are not only beautiful, they create powerful emotional connections. This is something I experience firsthand on a regular basis.

As Chairman, I spend a lot of time at the Corning Museum of Glass, including the new Contemporary Art and Design Wing. I am constantly inspired and moved by these pieces of art, and I see visitors have the same reaction. Corning Incorporated's headquarters also features glass art throughout the building, because of our appreciation for its beauty and

because of the positive effect that it has on our people.

So my question to you is: How do we not only take advantage of the problem-solving capabilities of this material set, but also get to the heart of humans' fundamental connection and reaction to glass? How can we take this technological moment and create a human moment that helps make the world a more stirring and moving place? I believe that's the real promise of the Glass Age, and we welcome your ideas.

Thank you.

WINNER: ANALYST CALL/INVESTOR MEETING

"Invest. Grow. Deliver."

Written by Dean Foust for David Abney,
Chairman and CEO, UPS



Delivered at 2017 UPS Investors Conference,
Feb. 21, 2017

Good morning, everyone. Today, we'll share with you our vision for the next three years and beyond.

You'll hear how we are investing in the next generation of our network—a smart logistics network that will fuel the next era of growth at UPS and enable us to deliver the returns you expect.

Indeed, those three words serve as the touchstones that drive our every decision:

Invest;
Grow; and
Deliver.

When we met at our last Investor Conference in late 2014 we promised to grow our business; maintain the highest operating margin and highest return on invested capital in the industry; and to deliver strong shareholder returns.

Here's our scorecard:

- Total company operating income has risen 14 percent to more than \$8 billion
- We returned 108 percent of our net income to shareholders, and
- Our return on invested capital remains the industry standard

What's more, we delivered on those goals while embarking on the most sweeping transformation of our network in decades—a global transformation that will enable us to take advantage of new growth markets and create greater efficiency in our existing business.

We're upgrading and investing aggressively in new sorting capacity, new automation, and new capabilities. We're investing in new flexibility even as we're bending the cost curve.

Two years ago, I said we were putting a renewed emphasis on growth and we have.

To extend our capabilities, we have announced 10 acquisitions and strategic partnerships with game-changing companies. We have invested more than \$5 billion to expand, automate and optimize our integrated global network.

And those investments are paying off:

- Since we met in late 2014, we've recorded eight consecutive quarters of double-digit growth in our international operating profits.

- We completed the first phase of ORION, generating more than \$400 million in annual cost savings and avoidance.

- What's more, ORION was not a one-off project, but part of an integrated IT ecosystem that will support new levels of efficiency and growth.

Now, we've heard from investors that you want to know more about how we plan to deploy additional capital to maintain long-term profitability.

Today, we'll discuss our plan to increase our capacity while generating approximately \$800 million to \$1 billion in annual cost savings and avoidance when we finish in three to five years.

We will continue to create value for our shareowners and maintain our capital discipline with the highest return on capital and highest margins in our industry.

We've been re-assessing every element of our operations—our product mix, our investment levels and our pricing. I am confident you'll see that we're moving in the right direction.

Looking back, we've been well aware that having the world's largest, most-efficient and most-integrated network has enabled us to maintain industry-leading margins ...

... even as our industry has been buffeted by a global recession, volatile oil prices, shifts in trade driven by currency and demand swings, expansion in trade, and the political uncertainties that have left businesses reluctant to invest.

By looking forward, we realize that to seize the opportunities before us and to achieve new levels of efficiency we need to bend the cost curve further—and we need to raise our investments above recent levels.

So for the next few years, we are ramping up our investments in automation, technology and capacity to build the smart logistics network of the future.

We are increasing our investment in fast-growing segments like healthcare, manufacturing and in e-commerce solutions for our B-to-C (business-to-consumer) and our B-to-B (business-to business) customers. We are also making acquisitions and entering into partnerships that extend our capabilities significantly.

Over the next several years, we will transform UPS to achieve new levels of efficiency, connectivity and growth. This will enable us to serve our customers with a smart, integrated and innovative logistics network that our competitors cannot match.

And we'll do this by maximizing the strength of our balance sheet to increase total investment and the power of our network to enhance our portfolio and service offerings.

Understanding the market dynamics and our customers' expectations is critical.

As part of our service expansion today, I am happy to announce that we're launching Saturday ground operations in the U.S. on a rolling basis with plans to reach a significant percentage of the U.S. population later this year.

Expanding our Saturday services will allow us to provide new levels of customer service. Saturday deliveries will also free up more ground capacity during the first half of the week.

That expands our delivery capacity with no incremental capital investment. It also maintains the flexibility to take advantage of new opportunities that come our way.

Let's talk further about automation.

Today, roughly 40 percent of eligible volume in the U.S. moves through selected sites with high levels of automation. But we've only just begun investing significantly in automating our facilities.

By 2021, we will have implemented high levels of automation in every eligible location throughout the country. And given the ongoing improvements in robotics and technology, we expect to add new automated capabilities along the way.

Think of it as the next generation of the UPS network—a smart, efficient and integrated network.

This isn't just a U.S. story, either.

All around the world, we're building out our network—deepening and widening the services we provide in fast-growing markets.

In fact, in 2016 our four fastest-growing markets included China, Vietnam, Pakistan and the United Arab Emirates—each of which recorded double-digit growth.

Collectively, the 15 developed and emerging markets we've prioritized offer between \$120 billion and \$130 billion in opportunity across all of our business units.

UPS is at the forefront of global trade. Over the last decade, global exports have grown at a 3.5 percent compounded annual rate while UPS exports grew at double that rate.

And we've helped deliver that growth around the world.

We are committed to helping our customers navigate the complexity in global trade and take advantage of the opportunity that comes with opening up markets.

Our global operating model has evolved to serve multi-nationals and small- and mid-sized businesses that also want to ship regionally and locally.

In fact, about 85 percent of our Europe business stays on the continent and about 70 percent of our international revenue comes from volume that never touches U.S. soil.

We look forward to expanding our International footprint through organic growth, partnerships and acquisitions. You'll hear more about this in the coming months.

There's no ignoring the fact that e-commerce is having a profound effect not just on retail, but on all of business as more and more companies start distributing directly to customers.

We believe the shift online is permanent.

In fact, the trend is accelerating and as a result we've embarked on a multi-year journey to create profitable solutions that enable us to lean in to this future growth—serving retailers, manufacturers and other businesses.

The good news is that as we ride the wave of e-commerce, the investments we're making in capacity and in new solutions will benefit all of our customers—regardless of industry.

That's important because just as e-commerce has changed consumer expectations, the Internet is changing B-to-B procurement.

The other good news is that adding more efficiency and technology in our integrated network will create more density on our routes, lower our operating costs and bolster our returns.

In summary, we are making these investments to increase the efficiency, the capacity and the profitability of our network.

We are investing so we grow and deliver for our shareowners.

I am confident you'll see how we're transforming our operations. This transformation will create great opportunities for our customers and our investors.

Thank you.

WINNER: COMMENCEMENT/CONVOCATION ADDRESS

"Gold in the Bushes"

By Jerry Wohletz for Dr. Gary Roberts, President,
American Dental Association



Delivered at Texas A&M College of Dentistry,
Dallas, May 23, 2017

Dean Wolinsky, faculty, guests and graduates, thank you for inviting me to share this day with you.

Forty years ago, I sat in the auditorium of Gaston Avenue Baptist Church anxiously awaiting my turn to walk across the stage to receive my diploma from your predecessor institution, Baylor College of Dentistry. My family sat in the audience, some not quite believing that I could make it from the cotton fields of west Texas to this point. My life, and that of my wife Teresa, was about to change. Hopefully with great success.

This is a speech about change and success, and we're celebrating both today. And it is a speech about how the two are related. I'll say from the start that I don't think you can achieve success without first learning to how to deal with change.

I have to say, it's great to be here with you in Dallas. I grew up in Texas, on a farm not far from Lubbock. It was the driest, dustiest place on Earth. And this is where I went to dental school. It is bittersweet being back.

Sweet because when I left that farm at 17 years old, broke as an iPhone dropped in a parking lot, dental school was just a pipe dream. Except for my wife Teresa and my kids, dental school was the best thing that ever happened to me.

And also bitter, because, well, dental school was different back then.

We had one crown and bridge professor, and his office was on the third floor. And if he didn't like your wax pattern he would crush it. If he didn't like your cast crown, he would just throw it out the window. And you would be down in the bushes looking for that little piece of gold.

He threw mine out the window once, and even though gold was thirty-

two dollars an ounce back then, hell, we had no money, let alone money to buy more gold. So down I went into the bushes.

I found that little piece of gold.

My grandfather told me when I was very young, "Life's not fair, get over it." The fair comes in September and lasts two weeks and it's got a Ferris Wheel and this isn't it. That's one lesson we were taught over and over in dental school. But it also taught us resilience.

Resiliency was, and still is, something they teach you, albeit in a kinder, gentler manner. I bet you all feel like you've just run a marathon. The pace of dental school is exhausting, the stress overwhelming. And I have good news and I have bad news. The good news is that as a result of that experience you're better equipped to keep that pace than you probably realize. And the bad news is, if you're doing it right, the feeling doesn't go away.

Dentistry isn't an easy career. You'll face roadblocks that you'll be powerless to change. Patients who come to you for treatment but don't practice home care, or who are convinced that flossing is a hoax. Hiring and firing people—two of the hardest things you'll do as business owners, not to mention learning about regulations and accounting.

What sets successful dentists apart from unsuccessful ones is their ability to confront change, and not be immobilized by it.

Last fall I met Christina Rosenthal, a dentist in Memphis, Tennessee. She told a story about how she grew up in a poverty-stricken area of Memphis, was raised by a single mother, and raised a toddler throughout dental school. She told me, "Statistically, I was never supposed to become a dentist."

Then she said something that struck a chord in me: "Dentistry has given me

more than a practice. It has given me purpose."

Purpose. What that means to me is that what you choose to do with your degree matters. Being a dentist matters.

It matters today like it mattered when I graduated because you have the opportunity to help people. You will make a decent living, but you'll also get the satisfaction of knowing that you helped someone out of a problem and you actually did some good in this world.

I remember a lot of my patients. A lot of them came to me when they were kids, really young kids, and now they're 50. I had patients that came to me when they were teenagers, and when they grew up they brought their children to me. That's purpose.

Some of them have even become dentists, and that's really gratifying... especially when you can't get your own kids to do it because they tell you that you work too hard.

Hearing Christina talk about turning adversity into purpose reminds me that spinning your wheels trying to change things that can't be changed—like growing up in a tough neighborhood or on a farm you want to leave—is a waste of time. Instead, focus energy on what you can change. If you do that, you'll find something more valuable than a career. You'll find purpose, and you'll find success.

Turns out there are endless opportunities to make changes in your work and your life, and it's up to you to decide what kind of dentist you will be.

What will you do with your degree?

The fact is, your degree comes with great responsibility. Society looks to you to be leaders, and it expects you to be involved in things that improve the area that you live in. To those whom much is given, much is expected.

But what I hope you won't do is be pushed around by societies' expectations about what it means to live a purposeful life, because society is going to tell you to do things that may not matter to you. Some will tell you that success is the size of your practice or the car you drive or the house you live in. Some might say that success is the amount of care you donate, or the number of people you help. Each of those might be part of your success, but it shouldn't define it.

Don't let the person sitting next to you tell you what your success will look like. Instead set high expectations for yourself. Always expect more from yourself than you do from anyone else, because you're the only one who can control you.

Young doctors, I'm jealous. I'm jealous because the potential to do transformative work in dentistry has never been greater than it is right now, and that's mostly driven by technology. You will do things in your career that I never even dreamed of. No one in my class would have ever thought that you could make an impression with a scanning wand. We would use that rubber base impression material and hope it wasn't too hot that day so

it wouldn't set up before you could get it in the mouth.

When we started using CEREC crowns, they kind of fit like socks on a rooster. And now, you're getting precision margins.

I found that one of the most meaningful ways I could change dentistry for the better was by getting involved in organized dentistry. Building and marketing a practice, staying up-to-date on science after you leave school, is a lot easier with tools and support. As President of the American Dental Association, I've been able to help 161,000 of my colleagues—and your colleagues, too—build successful practices by lobbying Congress to keep oral health protections for children and families in the health care law, by fighting for increases in funding for oral health research, and fighting to get rid of unnecessary and burdensome regulations.

That's been extremely satisfying. And I hope that each of you will choose to get involved with the ADA and take advantage of the tools that are available to you, and add your voice to the chorus that's advocating for dental education, patients, and dentists.

I'll close with one final thought.

I'm proud of my career, but the thing I'm most proud of in my life is my family. Family is everything to me.

There are a lot of accomplishments that I could name in this world, but they don't mean anything to me without my family. My wife and I said early on, "If we can raise a child who can be a good citizen, and leave this world better off, we've had a successful life."

We've raised two sons, and we have a magnificent daughter-in-law and a beautiful grandson.

Without a doubt, dentistry helped me to do that. It gave me a job where I could be with my children, coach t-ball and football and baseball. I could schedule my patients to allow me to do that.

Graduates, we are so proud of you. Be proud of what you do. How many professions can alleviate pain virtually immediately? How many professions can change a patient's self-image in one or two appointments? With your dental degrees, go out and do great work and leave the world a better place. Figure out what's most important to you, and make it your priority or make it your purpose.

And stay resilient. Never stop looking for that little gold crown in the bushes.

WINNER: EMPLOYEE MEETING

"Why the University of Florida Matters So Much to So Many"

By Chris Moran for Jack Payne, Senior Vice President for Agriculture and Natural Resources, University of Florida

Delivered via video at Extension Professional Associations of Florida Annual Conference, Fort Myers, Florida, Aug. 31, 2017

Good morning everyone! I am sorry not to be with you this year! Unfortunately, the Board of Governors is meeting on campus at the same time and the President has asked me to host them for dinner. However, I never want to miss a chance to tell you how much Extension means to IFAS, and how much it means to the University of Florida, so this video will have to do.

I don't like doing it this way. For one, Nick can pull the plug on me if

he doesn't like what I'm saying! Also, I miss all the fun of EPAF week. I don't get to spend currency with my own picture on it at the IFAS Bookstore. I don't get to hear Doug Mayo whooping in my ear at the auction to spend money with Ben Franklin's picture on it! And I don't get to catch up with so many Extension heroes in the hallways and at the meals.

Among the things that I will be telling the Board of Governors is how important your work is. It's a rare op-

portunity to tell the IFAS story directly to the men and women who govern all of Florida's public universities.

It's a story of how we can't be a truly great university unless we have great men and women like you delivering our science to the people of our state.

I continue to be impressed with the educational backgrounds of our County Extension faculty. For example, look at the team we've got in Sarasota County: 4 doctorates, a soon-to-be-minted doctorate, and 4

faculty with master's degrees. All in one office!

Speaking of advanced degrees, I want to take this opportunity to be the first person to publicly introduce FAMU Extension's Sandy Thompson as "DOCTOR Sandra Thompson." She earned her doctorate about two months ago.

Dr. Thompson, as a Community Resource Development program leader, connected Donnell Davis with no-cost landscaping for his new business in the city of Madison. She didn't stop there. She showed up and got dirty helping him put it in. Now, she's helping him hunt for resources to expand the business to include a grocery store.

This is the first development in Madison's Georgetown community in 40 years. And it's in a food desert. Dr. Thompson's inspiring work is a reminder of the great UF/FAMU partnership that helps the Florida Extension Service reach virtually every corner of this huge state.

At UF we have a president who appreciates the value of Extension. This is, after all, the fourth land-grant university for President Fuchs. As he mentioned last year in Daytona, we've only had two previous presidents who had worked at any land-grants prior to leading UF.

You might also remember that he talked about seven big goals for the decade ahead. He singled this one out: "A strengthened public engagement of the university's programs with local, national and international communities." That sounds to me like the very definition of Extension.

Since he last spoke to you, Dr. Fuchs has visited the UF/IFAS St. Lucie County and Volusia County Extension Offices. He's still saying he'll get to all 67! I'm going to turn up the heat on him a bit. If he doesn't pick up the pace, I'm going to tell him I've asked all of you to visit HIS office next time you're in Gainesville!

There's an increasing awareness in Tigert Hall and across campus that even if outreach isn't one of the metrics for the ratings magazines or

for preeminence, UF can't be a great university without a great Extension Service.

How could you measure the value of what Suwannee County CED Katherine Allen did to make a couple's 50th anniversary extra special? Patty Brickles enrolled in Katherine's weight loss class. Patty wanted to look good for a ceremony in which she and her husband would renew their wedding vows.

A few weeks before the big day, Patty was 40 pounds lighter than her pre-IFAS weight. She walked into a bridal store and found a gold dress for her golden anniversary that she couldn't possibly have fit into before she met Katherine.

She wore that dress to the ceremony. And she invited Katherine. When friends and family complimented Patty on how good she looked that day, Patty told them that Katherine was responsible, that she couldn't have done it without her.

Then there's David Holmes in Marion County. David has saved a lot of broken bones, and maybe even a life. He showed up at a track where jockeys were getting thrown from horses. The track had several circles of stunted turf. To the horses, these looked like holes, and the animals would slide to a sudden halt, catapulting their riders up and off.

With the help of Laurie Trenholm, who diagnosed the turf disease, Holmes came up with an inexpensive solution. He recommended altering the fertilizer schedule, limiting traffic on the turf, sharpening mowing blades, and even prescribing what height the grass should be before it's cut. Now the horses run the whole circuit without getting spooked. No more flying jockeys.

In Volusia County, a man named Josh suffered a traumatic brain injury in a car accident. That started a downward spiral as he first lost his job, and eventually his home. He was living on the street.

Family and Community Science Extension Agent Lisa Hamilton pulled him out of this spiral. She worked with Josh week after week to rebuild his life. When the two of them worked

to find his credit report, he could not remember answers to confidentiality questions, so they couldn't do it online. It was a laborious slog of paperwork. Josh would forget so much of what had happened the previous day. Lisa had to walk him through it again and again, like Groundhog Day.

But they finally got his credit report and corrected errors in it. Lisa connected Josh with a master money mentor who was a local banker. Josh ultimately got a loan to buy and repair a home. And it's close enough to his new job that he can get there without driving. A total turnaround from the man who was homeless before he met Lisa.

To you livestock agents out there, you can probably guess which agent says, "I love this part of my job, the blood and guts part of it." When Lindsey Wiggins of Hendry County is on a ranch looking for weeds, doing soils analysis, or talking about how much molasses to give the cows, she looks at the sky. If she sees buzzards, she gallops off looking for a carcass.

When she finds it, she examines it for tell-tale signs of panther predation. She takes pictures. Sometimes she even skins the animal. And she calls the Florida Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission, whose officials ask her further questions about what she sees. As a result, last year the first rancher in her multicounty area got a government check for a documented calf kill, and there are plenty more in the pipeline. That saves ranchers from monetary losses when non-paying customers like panthers eat their calves. It also saves panthers by offering a way out of the dilemma of cat versus cow.

Like Lindsey, many of you have close relationships with local Farm Bureau members. These are some of our most important stakeholders, and last year when Nick went on a listening session tour, he heard some of them publicly wonder about the UF/IFAS commitment to production agriculture.

So let's remind them. I would appreciate it if every one of you who attends local Farm Bureau meetings would share this message with them:

(Payne shares short video)

To get a link to that video, you can contact my office or Ruth Borger's office.

Just one more story about how you change lives.

Cheyenne was a fast-rising 4-H star in Walton County who had held multiple offices in county clubs. Then, her freshman year of high school happened. While she was 14, her parents got divorced, she was bullied at school, her father was deployed, and she was in an abusive relationship. Her prize-winning goat died. Her show horse got injured and could no longer compete.

You can imagine where that put Cheyenne—into a tailspin. There was even concern that she was suicidal. 4-H agent Jena Brooks Gilmore encour-

aged Cheyenne's mom to send her to Camp Timpoochee as a junior camp counselor.

Maybe it was the week away from it all. Maybe it was the opportunity to lead. Maybe it was that she learned what it was like to be admired by other kids again instead of bullied. By the end of the week, Cheyenne had a tear-filled heart-to-heart with Jena. Just the two of them on a camp bench. And Cheyenne said, "This 4-H stuff really works! I can be myself here, really my true self, and everyone is OK with that."

A few weeks after camp, it was Cheyenne's mom who was crying. She visited Jena in her office, and she told Jena, "Thank you. I don't know what you did, but thank you for bringing my baby back."

I know what Jena did. Because it's what all of you do. You improve people's lives, and sometimes even save them.

These stories are what make the University of Florida different from other universities. I know UF/IFAS distinguished itself at the recent National Association of County Agricultural Agents conference with too many awards to mention, and I congratulate Gene McAvoy for becoming the organization's vice president.

What you do is the reason UF matters so much to so many. It's a shame this goes unnoticed in university rankings. Let me assure you, it IS noticed in Gainesville.

Thank you so much for what you do to go the extra mile and to go change Florida for the better. Go Gators!

WINNER: EULOGY/TRIBUTE SPEECH

"Freedom Adds Colour to Our Lives"

By Johan Kroes for Jeanine Hennis-Plasschaert, Former Minister of Defence for the Second Rutte cabinet, The Netherlands

Delivered in Amsterdam, April, 23, 2017

Ladies and gentlemen,
From May 1939 to April 1945, Ravensbrück concentration camp had more than 150,000 prisoners. They were mostly women—women of all colour, all classes, and all nationalities.

There were also Dutch women at Ravensbrück—fearless women! During the Second World War, they took great risks by giving shelter to people in hiding or by participating in the Resistance.

One of these women was my great-grandmother, Johanna Maaïke Nouwen-De Mooij, who was born on 3 October 1882. In the 1920s she ran a milk business together with my great-grandfather, who died young. Several years later she was forced to sell the business. It was simply too much for her to maintain as a single mother.

To be able to support her children, she opened a boardinghouse in the centre of Amsterdam, on the Prins Hendrikkade, number 121. During the

war she gave shelter to people in hiding, because she felt that it was simply the right thing to do.

She was betrayed, arrested and deported on 26 July 1944 to Camp Vught, where she was prisoner number 01248. A month later she was put on the train and transported to Ravensbrück, together with many other Dutch women.

Upon arrival at Ravensbrück, they had to hand over their last possessions: letters, photographs, wedding rings. Some were forced to have their heads shaved, simply as a provocation. Their clothing was taken from them and replaced by a pale, striped dress.

They slept in grey barracks with little light. The beds were filthy and full of lice.

And every day at five o'clock in the morning, the siren sounded. In the dark, they had to line up for hours for roll call, the chilly wind from the Schwedtmeer cutting into their faces.

The guards screamed, growled and taunted them. The prisoners dubbed them 'grey mice'.

After the roll call, the women were subjected to forced labour—twelve hours a day in the grey Siemens factory located nearby. Long hours with the same monotonous never-ending motions and the constant, enormous pressure to meet the quota.

This quickly led to many women buckling under the strain and simply not being able to go on. This madness that took possession of some of these women was just one of the terrible things that these prisoners witnessed.

Due to overpopulation in the camp, rations became increasingly meagre: a thin slice of bread in the morning and a bowl of turnip soup in the evening. Selma van de Perre used to call this flavourless food 'sawdust' and 'water with grass'. Selma survived Ravensbrück and is with us here today.

It was also incredibly filthy in the

camp. Infectious diseases such as typhoid and tuberculosis spread rapidly. In the winter of 1944/1945, the extreme cold took many lives. And as time went on, more and more prisoners were killed in increasingly horrible ways.

The camp was characterised by a lack of colour. For many of the women who survived Ravensbrück, this is what is seared into their memory the most, along with all the atrocities that took place there.

And yet they continued to have hope and to persevere. These women remained steadfast in their refusal to believe that evil would prevail, and they rejected the dehumanisation they were subjected to.

They did so by taking care of each other using the medium of humour, inventivity and creativity.

Gisela Wieberdink, for example—who is also with us here today—composed songs that were passed on from person to person, such as the following song that was sung to the tune of ‘The Starry Skies of Hawaii’:

“Never will I forget the stunning splendour

Of the Ravensbrück summer toilet

The fashion this year is a blue-grey stripe

Preferably wrinkled and crushed”

Hetty Voute removed a ribbon from her shirt, cut it into eight pieces and tied it into curls throughout her hair.

Corrie ten Boom wrote in one of her books about the birthday of Mieke, who had tuberculosis:

“She needs hygiene and care. Here she has nothing. The only thing she has is love, we love her very much. It’s her birthday and they’ve made an incredible birthday table for her. Coloured paper and a few real flowers serve as decoration. A kind of cake—made of cold potatoes with bread and an arrangement of beets and some red radishes. It almost looks real.”

All these extraordinary stories of hope and consolation—in that exceptionally harsh setting—inevitably make me think of my great-grandmother.

And I hope—from the bottom of my heart—that she also felt this love

from her fellow prisoners, and that she was also cared for when she could no longer go on, just as she continued to look after her loved ones.

Her last letter from Camp Vught—just before her forced departure to Ravensbrück—reads as though she already sensed that her end was approaching. She wrote: “In these times, our lives can sometimes be over before we know it.”

She gave various instructions on how her belongings should be distributed. She left her undergarments to ‘Jet’ and to ‘Cor’. “They need the clothes the most”, stated my great-grandmother.

“Please divide up the jewelry that is still left. The sewing machine is for Jan or Piet since they don’t have one. The rest you can sell, but make sure that no family portrait ends up in some market stall.”

She also asked her children to place her body in the Eastern Cemetery of Amsterdam. “There I can rest in peace.” “And don’t make it a grandiose affair,” she added.

This selflessness was what struck me, along with the resignation that echoes so strongly in her words.

“No, children,” she wrote, “I don’t look back on what I allegedly should not have done. I only think about what I have been and done for you. I hope that better times will come once again and that you won’t have to face such grave problems as you do now. I also hope that you are able to make a decent living. That is my last wish for you all, from your loving mother”.

She herself never saw those better times. 72 years and 114 days ago, on 30 december 1944, she died in Ravensbrück camp.

She was 62 years old. Her last wish, to rest in peace in the Eastern Cemetery, remained unfulfilled.

I never knew my great-grandmother, but I did witness the grief—the silent grieving that so many families have experienced and continue to experience even today.

Ladies and gentlemen,

The dark days of Camp Ravensbrück came to an end in April 1945. Red Cross busses painted in white came and transported the women to Sweden.

Selma van de Perre recalls:

“When we arrived in Sweden, we were allowed to each pick out two dresses and a coat. I chose a bright red coat, a green dress and salaman-der shoes. I wanted as much colour as possible to dispel all that grey from the camp!”

Her words touched me.

Along with her reclaimed freedom, colour came back into Selma’s life and into the lives of all the women who survived Ravensbrück.

Today, so many years later, we take it all for granted:

That we are free.

Free to do and to say what we want.

Free to show our true colours.

But this freedom is not a foregone conclusion.

Even today, borders are crossed that we had hoped would no longer need to be protected—a hope that is clearly held in vain.

Because time and again we are confronted with terrible acts of terror.

Time and again, people are persecuted for their faith or their orientation, while others are forced to abandon their hearth and home because they stand up to dictatorial regimes.

We must stand firm in our defence of the freedom that we cherish so much—that should be our maxim.

We must be led not by fear but by a steadfast belief in the fundamental rights for which we have fought for so long and shall continue to fight for! That freedom, after all, has brought us so much.

And that freedom is well worth fighting for so that we can all enjoy a ‘decent living’, as my great-grandmother also wished for her children.

Ladies and gentlemen,

Let us do justice to our freedom!

That freedom adds colour to our lives.

Thank you.

WINNER: FAREWELL/RESIGNATION SPEECH

"Vulnerability, Curiosity, Courage"

By Jan Sonneveld for Jet Bussemaker,
Minister of Education, Culture and Science



Delivered at the 18th Evening of Science and Society,
The Hague, Oct. 9, 2017

Ladies and gentlemen,
As the negotiations to form a new government rolled on and on, I began to think I would keep this job forever. But tomorrow a new coalition agreement will be presented. And so I can say with absolute certainty that this will be my last presence at the Evening of Science and Society in this job.

This development has put me in the mood for reflection. It also opens up a window of opportunity for you—though of course you'll have to be quick. If you still have a bone to pick with me, you still have one last chance to press your case over dessert...

Of course, a setting such as this gives pause for reflection in any case: here in this wonderful Knight's Hall, discussing major issues in the very best of company. I therefore feel free to ask a major question of my own: How is the Netherlands doing at this point in time? And what direction should we be taking?

Taking a little distance, I see some wonderful things happening. We are the most competitive economy in Europe, thanks to our scientists, our creatives and our business community.

Our children are among the happiest in the world: our teenagers are less likely to be bullied, they feel supported by their parents and feel at home at school. This is as a testament to our schools, our parents and indeed to society as a whole. I also see a growing number of young immigrants entering higher education, while our society continues to lead the way when it comes to acceptance of the LGBT community. These are achievements of which I am incredibly proud.

But that pride is not unalloyed. There are also fields in which we are moving in the wrong direction and where we really need to work together

if we are to turn them around. Tonight, I want to talk about three pressing issues:

- we are increasingly living in separate worlds,
- our growing indifference,
- and our short-term thinking.

Let me say something about each of these trends in turn.

First, I see that it is becoming easier and easier to lock ourselves away in our own sealed living environment. We have seen the rise of the word 'filter bubble'. Pupils from the lower and higher streams of secondary education are less and less likely to cross paths at school. I regularly see how schoolkids in Amsterdam literally cycle past each other: one group—children of highly educated parents, mostly—making their way from the well-to-do suburbs to one of the city's leading schools.

Meanwhile the other group—many of them children from a migrant background—skirt around the centre on their way to its sister school. Two schools founded on the same principles, but inhabiting different worlds.

As a former scientist I have experienced the phenomenon for myself. I felt the pressure to continue publishing paper after paper on my own specialism. Until it dawned on me: If I carry on down this road, I'll end up knowing more and more about less and less. It's the kind of focus that leads irrevocably to an ever stricter division between disciplines. That particular bubble began to close in on me and led to the life-changing decision to go into politics.

This separation of worlds leads me to my second concern—a growing tendency towards indifference and inequality. In an indifferent and unequal world it becomes increasingly difficult to listen and to understand. It is all too easy to stick to your own narrow view.

To become the politician who says 'let me explain this to you one more time ...' It's a world in which the business sector will only pump money into an innovation if it can recoup its investment in no time at all: 'those gravitational waves are all well and good. But where's the revenue model?'

I see this attitude leading to a third danger and a cause for grave concern: a structural lack of sustainability. Nowadays we often think of sustainability purely in terms of climate and the depletion of precious raw materials. But this evening I would like to invite you to consider a different form of raw material: empathy and the ability to walk in someone else's shoes. At its most profound, sustainability is about the realization that the world is a fragile place. The planet itself is fragile, but so are we and so are our mutual relationships.

If these three trends—separate worlds, growing indifference and short-term thinking—continue apace, they will automatically lead us to view society as a system in which only two types of people exist: winners and losers. And politics will then become a series of binary choices. What we are quickly losing is the deep realization that society is so much more than our own self-interest at any given moment.

I am sure these are trends that strike a chord with you. Entrepreneurs and CEOs can see it in the constant pressure to compete. Scientists in the pressure to publish and engage in commercial knowledge transfer. In the cultural sector there is the pressure to reach ever larger audiences, and to propel every production towards a profit. And in sport, the need to fill stadiums or attract money from sponsors can take the pressure to perform to heights that are no longer good for us.

Of course, it is always easy to pin the blame on someone else. But when we are doing so, we are also looking in the mirror. And make no mistake, these same pitfalls apply to me too. Because politics is certainly no stranger to short-sightedness. One moment we are introducing a certain policy—only to scrap it a few years later. Politicians' memories are far too short and far too dependent on the typical four-year cycle of coalition governments. And today the political landscape is more unforgiving than ever: in the last elections my own party won a quarter of the votes. A figure that was slashed to not even 6 per cent at this year's elections.

Separate worlds, indifference, short-term thinking—they affect us all. If you allow this realization to sink in, you immediately begin to experience how incredibly fragile the balance of society really is. And once this fragility hits home, your first reflex might be to think: we have to do something! Our society has to become more resilient!

Very true. But in my opinion, this can only be achieved by first embracing that same fragility—by living in the full realization that everything of value is truly defenceless. But how do we do that? I may be a politician, but I do not pretend to have all the answers. Nonetheless, you and I can begin to tonight to embrace the fragility of life by doing three things:

- 1) we can dare to be vulnerable,
- 2) we can be curious about what is 'different' or 'other',
- 3) we can have the courage to stand up for what fragile and defenceless.

Over the past four years I have tried to steer Education, Science, Culture and Emancipation policies into this direction. Always realizing that the outcome would be uncertain. I did so by asking a journalist to report on the separate worlds in our schools. I did so by putting equal opportunities back on the educational agenda. And we did so by asking everyone in the Netherlands an open question: what do you think are the most important questions for science?

But I also have to face the fact that—despite all my good intentions

and those of so many others in society—the tide cannot be turned by politics alone. For a socialist minister of education, that is sometimes a frustrating conclusion.

It has reminded me of just what a broad, social issue this is. An issue that should involve absolutely everyone: the small entrepreneur and the captain of industry, the coach and the artist, the opinion maker and the journalists, the thinkers and the doer, our mothers and our fathers...

And yes, it still remains a task for politicians. Don't get me wrong: all the rumoured new investments in Education and Science are important. But obliging school children to sing all 15 verses of our national anthem ... Is that really going to help promote equal opportunities? Is that really going to make us more curious about what is 'different'?

Of course, there is more to the coalition agreement than meets the eye, even if the full document has already been tactically leaked to the press. But real Trust in Our Future—as the new government's motto is said to be—goes far beyond policy plans and a sound budget. Real trust starts by showing vulnerability, curiosity and courage. It's about a team of government ministers who lead from their deepest convictions. With this in mind, I sincerely hope that our new cabinet will keep an open mind on the unknown and a watchful eye on the vulnerable.

Robert F. Kennedy couldn't have put it better when he said: 'The gross national product does not allow for the health of our children, the quality of their education or the joy of their play. It does not include the beauty of our poetry or the strength of our marriages, the intelligence of our public debate or the integrity of our public officials. It measures neither our wit nor our courage, neither our wisdom nor our learning, neither our compassion nor our devotion to our country, it measures everything in short, except that which makes life worthwhile.'

I sincerely hope that our new government will not focus solely on mac-

roeconomics. If the reorganization of all school classes along academic level yields 0.4% economic growth while sacrificing interaction, understanding and integration, what choice should I make? And what does it mean to say that giving children the chance to repeat a year of their schooling costs 500 million euros, when one year's patience with a child is priceless?

International research consistently calls us to recognize that we have reached a tipping point: that the success of our society increasingly depends on skills that we are barely able to quantify, such as curiosity and creativity. It is a call that I would very much like to pass on to my successor.

Ladies and gentlemen,

Moral leadership asks us to look beyond our budget and our time in office. This means you and I must have an honest conversation. So let us ask ourselves: what are we contributing to what really matters?

Do we dare to show our vulnerability, to be curious about others and to stand up for the defenceless? Let us here tonight resolve to help each other to gain new insights from unexpected angles. Allow me to introduce you to three Dutch people who gave me new insights:

The first is Iris van Herpen—the young, world-famous fashion designer who works at the interface between art, technology and science. With boundless curiosity, she works with fragile materials and draws new inspiration from the CERN particle accelerator in Switzerland. This month she will be the highly deserving recipient of the most prestigious Dutch state prize for the arts, the Johannes Vermeer Prize.

The second is Evelien Oostdijk. As a physician in training, she carried out research into the effects of preventive antibiotics in the intensive care unit. When she was informed about an error in the research that she had already published, she immediately had all the raw data reanalysed by others—not knowing what the outcome would be. And she had her article withdrawn from a leading scientific journal and replaced.

And my third source of inspiration is Eberhard van der Laan—the Mayor of Amsterdam, a remarkable man who we lost just last week. I miss him dearly. I remember how we became colleagues as government ministers. I can still hear his voice asking me question after question—completely open, completely vulnerable—in his efforts to find out how things worked and whether he understood things correctly. And how his curiosity led him to help resolve a local conflict which he could easily

have let pass him by. And I remember his courage as Mayor of Amsterdam, in focusing on dealing with a hard core of 600 young, violent criminals.

Vulnerability, curiosity, courage—they may seem inextricably bound up with grand gestures. But more often than not, they are about the small decisions we take in our daily lives, decisions which may seem self-evident, but which can have a profound, positive influence on others and on the world around us.

I call on all of you—and I call upon my successor and the incoming new government—to let yourself be inspired by the people around you—different, ordinary, special, all at once.

It's the only way to break the pattern of separate worlds, growing indifference and short-term thinking. And to create a sustainable society that we can pass on to our children.

Thank you very much.

WINNER: INAUGURAL SPEECH

"What Kind of Leaders Will We Be?"

By Leanne Boyer for Dr. David O. Barbe,
President, American Medical Association



Delivered at AMA Annual Meeting,
Chicago, June 13, 2017

Thank you. It is an honor to stand before you tonight. I am excited and eager to have the opportunity to lead the nation's largest and most influential physician organization as your president. Now is the time when we as physicians have an unprecedented opportunity to shape the future of not only our profession, but for our patients and all of health care for years to come.

Let me begin tonight by recognizing some very special people:

First, I want to thank Dr. Gurman and Dr. Stack—for their leadership, their mentoring and their friendship. That appreciation extends to the Board members, as well. We have the strongest and most diverse Board I can recall—it is this kind of Board the AMA needs to capture the perspectives of our profession and address the challenges that we face.

I would also like to thank the AAFP leadership, their AMA delegation and all the family physician delegates and alternates in the House for their support, encouragement and advocacy on my behalf over the years.

Next—my most sincere appreciation to the Missouri State Medical Association delegation and MSMA staff. If it

weren't for their willingness to not only encourage but to support me beginning over 20 years ago when they sent me to this House as an alternate delegate, I literally would not be in this position to serve you and our profession.

I also cannot adequately express my appreciation for the Mercy leadership who have made it possible for me to have time away from both my practice and my leadership responsibilities to serve our profession. Their presence here tonight is evidence of that support.

Mercy leadership is among the most visionary in our industry. From them I have acquired knowledge, skills and expertise that have made me a better leader and enhanced my contributions to the discussions here at the AMA.

Mercy is a leader in the area of telehealth and virtual care. It is a little ironic that through the magic of the EHR and WebExs, I remain in nearly continuous contact with my patients and the leadership team at Mercy whether I'm in Chicago, Washington, or at a World Medical Association meeting in Africa.

They often don't know if I'm in Mountain Grove or a thousand miles away. In fact, I've started referring to

myself as "the virtual Dr. Barbe."

Lynn, Mike, Fred, Alan, Rob, Brent, Stuart, and Jenine—thank you very much!

My clinic manager, Lois Flageolle, is here tonight with her husband Ron. Unless it is your spouse, how many of you have the same clinic manager you started with in practice? I do. Lois started with me the very first day I opened my solo, independent practice in Mountain Grove 34 years ago and has been my clinic manager throughout that entire time. Thank you, Lois, for making our practice so very successful and satisfying.

Now, let me recognize my family here tonight –

I have to begin with my wife, Debbie. We played kick the can together as young children when we lived one short block apart in Mountain Grove. We became high school sweethearts when we played George and Emily in the high school production of *Our Town*.

Debbie raised our two children, worked by my side in our clinical practice, and always keeps the home fires burning. We celebrated 41 years of marriage a month ago. I could not have imagined or asked for a better

wife, partner and friend. Debbie, I love you.

My daughter, Adelle McAlister and her husband Matt and their two sons, Caelan and Conner.

My son, Nathaniel, who I am proud to say is the newest DOCTOR Barbe, having just graduated last month from the Kentucky College of Osteopathic Medicine—his wife Cheryl, and their four children, Ava, Micah, Claire and Samuel.

My brother Mike and his wife Suzanne, and my uncle, Al Breitenbach,

Inaugural speeches are intended to inspire the audience, rally the troops, and lay out the president's priorities for the coming year. I intend to do that, but in a little different way than you might expect.

This is actually a fairly intimate group in this room tonight. Most of us know each other reasonably well. So, my remarks tonight are going to be a little more personal—a little more about us—and our roles and responsibilities as we wrap up the HOD tomorrow and return home to our “day jobs.”

Earlier this spring, the AMA released the results of a physician survey that affirm my own view of medicine as a career choice:

- Half of physicians believe their choice of medicine was not just a job, but a calling.

- Three out of four of us are primarily motivated by the opportunity to make a difference in the lives of our patients.

- And nearly three out of four of us knew we wanted to be physicians before we were out of our teens.

For me, that calling came a little later.

I did not feel the specific calling to be a physician until early in college. After I finished high school, like many of you, I knew I wanted to help people, to make a difference—but I thought I was going to do this by becoming a math teacher ... I was really turned on by helping other students understand math and science.

But after a year or two at the Uni-

versity of Missouri, it dawned on me how much of being a physician was being a teacher—essentially teaching people about their own health—and that maybe medicine, for me, would be the highest and best calling and the way to fulfill my desire to make a difference in people's lives in a very direct way.

So, I changed my major from math to microbiology and set my sights on becoming a family physician.

Our hometown of Mountain Grove is a low-income, underserved area. The population is less than 5,000. Median household income is less than \$28,000 per year, compared to a state-wide average of \$50,000 per year. Many people are unemployed, uninsured and in other ways fall through the cracks in society.

Debbie and I saw our return to Mountain Grove as a “mission” that appealed to our desire to serve and make a difference in the lives of patients and our community. And it is still our mission 34 years later to serve our neighbors and friends ...

My practice continues to be immensely rewarding and satisfying. Hardly a week goes by that I don't get a card or a comment from a patient or family member thanking me for helping them get the care they need.

But every day I also see patients who need tests or treatments ... who are still uninsured ... or haven't met their deductible, and due to this, often delay necessary care.

Because of these patients, I see firsthand, every day, why the AMA's unwavering goal of affordable health insurance coverage for all is worth fighting for.

Keeping this issue front and center is critical as we debate health system reform ... again ... and again. ... and again!

Just a couple of weeks ago I had the honor of delivering the commencement address at the Kentucky College of Osteopathic Medicine. As I mentioned earlier, that event was especially meaningful for me because my son, Nathaniel, was presented with his doc-

tor of osteopathic medicine degree at that ceremony.

It just so happens that his Dean, Dr. Boyd Buser, is president of the American Osteopathic Association, and with us on stage this evening.

Recognizing that those young men and women are our future colleagues ... and the physicians to whom we will one day leave this profession, I tried to impart some words of wisdom about leadership ... words that I hoped they wouldn't forget five minutes after I finished speaking.

I told them that whether or not they thought of themselves as leaders, simply by virtue of being physicians, they ARE leaders.

Patients will look to them to lead their care ...

Other members of the health care team will look to them for leadership ...

And our profession needs them to be involved and to lead.

I gave them a challenge in the form of a question. I said to them: You are a leader ...

What kind of leader will you be?

I think that question applies to every medical student, resident, and physician in this room tonight. What kind of leaders will we be?

I recognize that every physician here is already a leader at some level. Sitting behind me there are state medical society presidents, AMA past presidents, AAFP and AOA presidents, and the Board. There are many past—and future—state and specialty society presidents in the audience.

But being accomplished in our field, or holding formal leadership positions within our organizations, does not automatically make us good leaders.

We must each continually ask ourselves: What kind of leaders will we be?

I submit to you that physician leadership is less about a title or position and more about being a positive influence in whatever setting we find ourselves.

Leadership is:

- Modeling the behaviors we need from others ...

- Working cooperatively . . .
- Developing solutions by consensus . . .

- Improving care by drawing on the unique skills of all members of the health care team . . .

- And demonstrating integrity and respect in our interactions with others.

There are three areas where physician leadership is absolutely critical right now:

- in advocating for health reform in today's political environment,
- in describing and shaping the future of health care,
- and in mentoring those who will one day follow us in this profession.

About 10 years ago, the AMA launched a campaign to raise awareness about the 50 million Americans who were uninsured, and to develop solutions to expand coverage.

We worked with both parties in Congress on the "Voice for the Uninsured" campaign.

Both political parties were very open to our policy suggestions, and in fact, many of our policy proposals were showing up in recommendations from think tanks and legislation on both sides of the aisle.

Everyone understood the costs involved in expanding coverage to tens of millions of Americans who were uninsured.

But just couple of years later, in the wake of the 2008 election, the debate over the Affordable Care Act became very partisan. Many consensus positions that had bipartisan support were being abandoned, not because they were wrong, but because the wrong party proposed them.

We are seeing a similar scenario unfolding now in the health reform debate. There are some factions in Washington that both then and now are saying not only "no," but "Hell no" when it comes to working together . . . even on some of the most basic principles of access, availability and affordability.

I submit to you: that might be good theater, but it is not good policy... it's not good politics... and it is definitely not good leadership.

Good leadership is constructive . . . Consensus-building . . . and principled.

Yet, good leadership lays down few absolutes.

Here's an AMA example that is very near and dear to those here tonight: no one who has gained insurance under the ACA should lose it . . . But this principle from our health reform objectives is flexible and practical. We are willing to consider options for better, more cost-effective ways to cover the uninsured than we are doing now.

Our measure of any policy change should be this: Does it represent progress? Is it an improvement?

We must oppose efforts to weaken the health care system or cause our patients harm. And we must always be open to alternative approaches to achieve our goals.

We cannot allow ourselves or our debate to be corrupted or co-opted by the hyper-partisan political climate. We, as physicians, as a profession, are better than that. As physician leaders, we bear greater responsibility within our profession and society. We must continue to put our patients before politics.

Physicians are trained and experienced in difficult conversations—let's put that expertise to work. Our role in today's advocacy climate means de-escalating highly charged partisan rhetoric. It means working with all stakeholders on issues that are simply too big to be left to the parochial interests of one party or the other.

When it comes to health care advocacy, we are the leaders. What kind of leaders will we be?

Beyond reform, physician leadership is critical in describing and shaping the future of health care.

The AMA, hands down, is the organization in the best position to understand the problems that patients and physicians face and help develop solutions to improve the quality and delivery of health care in America.

On Saturday, Dr. Madara told us about recent successes in the AMA's strategic arcs of endeavor.

It's a new way of describing the many ways the AMA is shaping health

care, but the mission and purpose remain the same.

- The AMA is leading the way by listening to, supporting and empowering physicians and medical students in their quest to provide the best patient care.

- The AMA is leading the way as a representative of all physicians through our House of Delegates, as we work together to bring to life the ambitious AMA mission to improve the health of our nation.

- And of critical importance, the AMA is leading the way by serving all physicians through our three interconnected strategic arcs, which demonstrate our commitment to helping physicians grow professionally, solving physician workflow needs, and improving the practice environment.

I am passionate about all of this work, because it will allow us

- to be better prepared,
- have better tools,
- and give better patient care.

Taken together, this is the way we will restore the joy to the practice of medicine.

When it comes to shaping the future of our profession, we are the leaders. What kind of leaders will we be?

Finally, physician leadership means encouraging and mentoring those who will follow us. We must ensure that others are ready to take our place.

Tom Peters, the author of several books about business management, puts it this way: "Leaders don't create followers; they create more leaders."

We must encourage and mentor students, residents and our younger colleagues and be an example of leadership for them, so they can in turn, become the leaders their patients, practices and our profession so desperately need.

I've had the opportunity to speak to several student and resident groups recently. I always encourage them to join all of their relevant professional societies—county, state, specialty, and, of course, the AMA.

Why? There are many reasons, but in the context of tonight's remarks,

physicians need to support one another now more than ever before.

Our medical societies provide a network of professional support that is one ingredient in the antidote to burnout. We lift one another up during times of difficulty and encourage one another to be our best.

When it comes to encouraging and mentoring others in our profession, we are the leaders: What kind of leaders will we be?

Every day, I marvel at what a gift it is to do what we have the privilege of doing as physicians. I feel intense

gratitude to have had the opportunities I have had to help patients, families, and my profession.

I am eager to serve you and our profession this coming year and to continue the great work that we are doing together.

I'll close by posing the question one last time: As physicians, we are leaders. What kind of leaders will we be?

Tonight, I challenge each of you, and re-dedicate myself, to be the leaders that our patients, our practices and hospitals, and our profession need us to be.

Let us be the leaders who bring consensus solutions to difficult issues.

Let us be the leaders with the creativity and drive to shape the future of medicine.

Let us be the leaders who mentor our next generation of physicians.

Let us be the leaders John Quincy Adams envisioned when he said, "If your actions inspire others to dream more... learn more... do more... and become more... you are a leader."

Thank you.

WINNER: MOTIVATIONAL SPEECH

"Think Big. Act Small. Start Somewhere."

By Antonie van Campen for Tom Middendorp,
Former Chief of Defence, The Netherlands

//

Delivered at Afsluitdijk,
The Netherlands, Sept. 7, 2017

Ladies and gentlemen, a week ago, someone close to me asked me why I was attending today's event. "You'll be leaving office shortly", she said, "so why spend your precious time on social innovation?"

Well, that is exactly why I wanted to be here today. Over my almost forty years of service, I have seen how the world has changed. Become more complex, more uncertain. And I believe, therefore, that we need more than a purely military approach.

Just look at the world today. Instead of the single threat we faced during the Cold War, we now face many. The spread of terrorism, the global refugee crisis, droughts, pandemic diseases, food crises, dangerous new technologies... All of these affect our lives, one way or another. And we all know that no single power, country or international organization can deal with these problems on its own. Let alone a military force.

Of course, the international community can always call on the military to keep people safe, to provide humanitarian aid, or to intervene with weapons when all else has failed. But my

men and women CANNOT address the root causes of conflict and disaster. They cannot prevent grasslands from turning into barren deserts... solve a water crisis... or stop millions of people fleeing their homes. My men and women can only be part of the solution.

The ultimate solution, however, requires the combined efforts of many. Not only of diplomats, politicians, development workers, and soldiers. But also the combined efforts of creative minds, of people who think outside the box. People like the innovators present here today. People like you.

All of you are needed to make this world a safer place. And the good thing is that we, the military, can help you to accomplish that. By offering you a platform for innovation, for instance. And help get your ideas past the 'promising stage'. The only thing we need, is for all of us to think big, act small, and start somewhere.

Let me explain to you what I mean. By using an example from my own experience. As a young engineer, I learned how to clear minefields. It was a dangerous and time-consuming job.

You basically lay down on the ground fully focused, and probe the soil. Inch by inch. Because as you know, mines can be ruthless killers. And if they don't kill you, they will certainly cost you an arm, a leg, or a foot.

I experienced that later in my career, as a commander in Uruzgan, in Afghanistan. Never will I forget the images of a ten-year old Afghan boy, laying in a hospital bed with a gap where his leg should be. A boy who just the day before had picked up a toy car containing an explosive...

Just as I will never forget the image of an old Afghan woman with no foot, and bandages around her leg, who just the day before had walked to the market to buy food. Those experiences showed me just how mines really are the 'worst soldiers'. They don't care if you are the enemy, a farmer working his land, or a child at play. Mines will kill or injure anyone.

And the worst thing is... there are still millions of unexploded devices out there. Scattered over 98 countries and territories worldwide. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, for instance, more than a hundred thousand mines are

still buried along the former front lines. Killing and injuring people. Including children. Victims of a war that ended long before they were born.

So yes, what we can do—and what we are doing right now, is sign treaties, send in troops, donate to charities, and set up red warning signs—with skull and crossbones—hoping that people will avoid dangerous areas. But we can do even more. We can invent creative solutions to deal with this permanent threat. And help them on their way to becoming a reality.

That is exactly why I invited the Hassani brothers to my office last month. You may not know them, but they fled Afghanistan nineteen years ago. And they now live in the Netherlands, where they dedicate their lives to the clearing of landmines. Here they are... Massoud—on the left—is now 33 years old. And his younger brother—Mahmud—is 30.

When these brothers were children, they saw their friends in Afghanistan lose limbs to land mines. They saw their friends killed... by landmines. That is why they are so dedicated. Why they want to make a change.

‘But how?’, you may well ask. Well, they first invented a giant blue ball that looks like an octopus and that rolls around in the wind. With its bamboo stalks and plastic disks, it can roll around dangerous areas, detonating mines. But this ball turned out to be too light. So they needed to come up with a better approach.

That is why for the last three years, the Hassani brothers have been developing a mine-hunting drone. Together with a team of 21 young engineers from all over the world. Today, this drone is not only able to fly over a mined area, but it also generates a detailed 3D map with a built-in aerial mapping system, it uses a metal detector to pinpoint any landmines, place a detonator on top of the mine with its robotic arm, flies away, and BOOM—let the explosive do the work.

According to the brothers, these capabilities make the drone not only safer, but also twenty times faster than

existing devices. AND two hundred times cheaper than traditional demining methods. Can you imagine? It means this mine-hunting drone can be a real lifesaver!

But before the brothers can actually prove this, they need to finish their prototype and start testing it with real landmines. And that is where I can help. So I offered Massoud and Mahmud the opportunity to test their drone regularly at one of our military test facilities. Where they also have the chance to talk to my military experts. To further improve their innovation as they go along. And hopefully to live their dream; and that is to help clear all 110 million landmines worldwide.

Ladies and gentlemen... Think big. Act small. Start somewhere. That is what the Hassani brothers did. And that is what I am trying to do by offering them our test facilities, and our military knowledge. But this principle can be applied to any challenge the world is facing. There are, after all, plenty of smart and devoted brains out there. People who can help us overcome water and food shortages. Who can help us conquer diseases. Or eradicate terrorism. Just as there are many people and organisations out there who can support these creative minds in taking that first step. By investing money in start-ups, for instance. Or by introducing start-ups into their own networks. Or, as I did, by offering their organisation as a platform, for testing prototypes.

Yet there are other ways as well in which we can think big, act small and start somewhere. Let me give you one more example from my own experience. Six months ago, we—the Dutch Ministry of Defence—organised the Future Force Conference. And we invited twelve hundred people from all over the world, and from all walks of life. Not just military personnel, policy makers, researchers, and CEOs... but also white-hat hackers, architects, economists, students, social scientists, and artists. So they could all meet, connect, and spread ideas.

In fact, I told everyone during the

conference, that no matter how far-fetched their ideas were, we should all be willing to at least listen to them. But the funny thing is, I had to remind myself of that... Because during a coffee break, a man approached me, and he asked me: “General, what if I were able to produce water out of thin air, in the middle of the Sahara desert—the driest, hottest place on earth—just by using the sun?”

Then he fell silent, and looked at me with a twinkle in his eye. Waiting for my reaction. So I smiled at him, and said: “Sir, it sounds fantastic. Hopefully—one day—you’ll manage to do so”. And I turned around.

But then I realised, I should practise what I preach. So I turned back to him, and asked him to explain what he meant. He told me enthusiastically that he was a Dutch artist, named Ap Verheggen. And that he wanted to make a device that could extract water from air. Solar-powered. ‘SunGlacier technology’, he called it. And it was certainly not meant to be ‘just art’. No, this man believed his technology was the solution to any water shortage crisis on earth...!

He said: “General, many people believe the desert to be the driest place on earth. But desert air can be very humid. The hotter it gets, the more water the air can contain. Now, usually, higher temperatures also mean more sunshine. So why not focus on harvesting water from the air, powered only by renewable solar energy...?”

“The principle is really quite simple. When you grab a can of soda out of the fridge on a hot summer day, water droplets appear on the surface. That is how I want to make it work: Condensation. The only thing I need is to test my theory in harsh conditions. By trial and error, you know. And again and again. Until it works”.

Then he fell silent, and stared at me. Again awaiting my reaction. Now some of you might understand why I was still sceptical. His concept, after all, seemed a bit like science fiction to me. I mean, from a scientific perspective, producing fresh water out of desert air... How

is that going to work? But then again, solar technology has taken huge strides in recent years. And just the thought that it might work... That one day, he would be able to solve water scarcity. And thus be able to prevent failed harvests, prevent people from fleeing their homes, or prevent children from dying. How could anyone be against that—how could I be against that?

So I said something rather unusual. I told him: “Listen, I would like to offer you the opportunity to test your technology at our military base in Mali. With its forty, fifty degrees Celsius (120° F), Mali is one of the hottest and driest places on earth. Living there basically feels like living in an oven. I know it is not a safe place, but being able to experiment at a military camp does mean working in relatively safe conditions. Besides, my men and women can make sure you get there, and arrange a place for you to sleep. So whatever you need to bring, just bring it. And then try to make this idea of yours work!”

Now, I don’t think he believed me at that moment. Because he looked surprised, nodded, and gave me his card. But a few weeks later, when he was invited by my staff to plan this trip, he knew for sure. He and his colleagues were going to Africa, to Mali. It was for real! And he would not be the only one. Because I offered a young social innovator—whom I also met during the Future Force Conference—the same opportunity.

This young man, Emad, had fled from Iran to live and study in The Hague, in the Netherlands. Where he is now working hard to invent a water treatment device that is the size of a

coffee machine. This device has the potential to use solar energy to purify AND desalinate water. As much as twenty litres per hour! This young man’s ambition? To provide a solution to drinking water shortages in refugee camps in the Middle East, and elsewhere in the world.

So what if he were also able to further develop his prototype? And turn it into a small and affordable device, one that could produce drinking water all over the world? That would present huge possibilities. Not only for families worldwide, but also for today’s armed forces, who often find themselves in bone-dry areas. Where the available water is often not drinkable.

Think big, act small, start somewhere. Again, that is what it’s all about. For Emad, the young social innovator, ‘thinking big’ means producing drinking water all over the world. His act is to build a small and inexpensive device, to purify and desalinate water. And our common start was the field test in Mali.

For Ap, the artist, ‘thinking big’ means trying to solve water scarcity. His act is to build a device that can extract water from hot, dry air. And our common start was the Mali field test.

And for the Hassani brothers, ‘thinking big’ means clearing all landmines worldwide. Their act is to construct an inexpensive mine-hunting drone. And our common start is at our engineers test facility in the Netherlands.

And the great thing is, this principle does actually work! It does lead to something bigger. Both experiments in Mali, for instance, provided valuable field-testing results. The water

purification project proved to be much easier, and less energy-consuming than previously assumed. And despite the extreme dry and hot conditions, Ap—the artist—was able to extract water from desert air!

In fact, his technology was all over the news when he returned to the Netherlands, and it resulted in other tests, and the building of a new machine. He has now even found an investor, and the application for a patent was granted, proving that his theory was true. Ap is actually one of today’s contestants. So you will be hearing all about his innovation later on.

But Ap is not the only one with a great story. All today’s contestants have invented great and inspiring innovations. You are all unsung heroes, who keep future generations in mind. And with our, and other people’s help, all of your innovations could get past the ‘promising stage’. That’s why you were invited here today. That’s what Ideas from Europe and Making Waves are all about.

So ladies and gentlemen, let’s not walk the path of peace alone. Thinking that our worlds are too far apart. Let’s think big, act small and start somewhere!

And to all social innovators present here today, I would like to say: Don’t hesitate. Don’t wait. Just tell everybody, every organization, how they can help. How to help you, but most importantly, how to help others worldwide who need your innovations. So that together we can indeed find solutions for the challenges that we face, and make this world a little safer. For everyone.

Thank you.

WINNER: STATE-OF-THE-INSTITUTION SPEECH

"Tomorrow's Industries from Today's Science"

By Jenna Daroczy for Dr. Larry Marshall, Chief Executive, Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Australia



Delivered at the National Press Club of Australia, Canberra, Australia, Nov. 8, 2017

I would like to begin by acknowledging the Ngunnawal and Ngambri people as the Traditional Owners of the land that we are on today, and pay my respect to their Elders past and present.

Thank you all for being here today, and a special hello to CSIRO's partners and collaborators in the room, we couldn't deliver profound national benefit from science without you.

I will note one of the faces missing today, our Minister, Arthur Sinodinos, and send him our best wishes for a speedy recovery.

Today in Australia, we can reach customers anywhere on the planet, but our competitors can come at us from any direction and we may never see them coming.

We are more connected to the rest of the world than ever before.

Today our world is flat—but a flattened world comes at a cost: it makes it too easy to lie down.

We used to be a nation of proud innovators, Aussie ingenuity created industries out of a barren landscape.

But as we've become more connected to the rest of the world, our reliance on Aussie ingenuity has waned.

Instead of pride in our powers of innovation, we're now proud early adopters of solutions from across the seas.

So today I want to tell you about a new chapter in your national science agency, a chapter written to solve these seemingly un-solvable problems—because that's what science does.

I'm going to talk to you about three changes at CSIRO: Speed; Market Vision; and Reinvention.

- Speed to take science off the lab bench and turn it into real world benefit at an accelerated pace, recognising the speed of change in the world around us.

- Market Vision to find the pivot in our national industries that will secure our advantage, before someone else beats us to it.

- And reinvention to realise the next leaps forward for each of our industries.

CSIRO isn't changing because science has changed, but because in times of change it's easy to forget that we've been here before.

We've been disrupted.

We've closed down old industries and we've created new ones.

And the answers weren't always obvious, but we knew where to start looking.

Today, the word 'innovation' means something different to everyone.

The most recent Australian Innovation System report highlighted this by defining two kinds of "innovation".

There's "new to market", when a business invests in their own novel products.

Only 5.5% of Australian companies do this.

Then there's "new to business" innovation, which is just adopting someone else's idea.

19% of Australian businesses copy innovation.

The rate of Australian innovation has declined consistently since the Global Financial Crisis, making us no longer an innovation leader, but an innovation follower.

It's probably no surprise I'm a big fan of innovation.

I was offered a bet of \$50 not to say 'innovation' today and I realised in that moment, just how much of a buzzword it has become.

Why?

Innovation has become synonymous with automation—which in turn has become synonymous with up to 40%

of jobs being lost—not just for us but for our children.

Today I want to give you a few reasons to come back to science, to feel optimistic about our future, and perhaps to even get a glimpse of these ephemeral "jobs of the future" we keep hearing about.

100 years ago, a visionary Prime Minister—Billy Hughes—surveyed the serious challenges facing a fledgling nation, and called for an organisation of scientists to re-shape Australia's destiny.

I'm deeply honoured to lead that organisation, our national science agency, the CSIRO—or sih-roh.

Billy wanted what you want: solutions from science.

That's innovation.

Over the past 100 years, we've solved problems as wide-ranging as this wide, brown land itself:

- We controlled pests like rabbits with myxomatosis and tackled flies with dung beetles.

- We re-invented industries like cotton and barley to give Australia an unfair advantage.

- And we transformed the world with breakthrough inventions like ultrasound imaging and fast WiFi.

But today, Australia faces a completely different set of challenges: digitisation, automation, and globalisation.

Once again, our people fear an uncertain future.

And yet, the answers are right under our nose—and on our backs.

Australian science is in your cotton shirt, and in your wool suit, and in the permanent pleat.

It's the polymer bank notes in your wallet, and the wireless in your phone.

You're seeing the world through extended wear contact lenses, watching an ultrasound image of a baby yet to be born—and when they are, they'll be

wrapped in a wool blanket washed in Softly.

So why should we look to science?

Because in every recession, in every revolution, in every major shift of an economy around the world—science has created the new industries that emerged from the turmoil, and those new industries created new value that grew the economy.

Those science enabled industries—created the jobs of the future.

That's the power of science, that's why CSIRO is here.

Let me take you out of this luxurious air-conditioned room, far away from all this technology, far back in time, back to Australia's beginnings.

Australians have historically been phenomenal innovators, going all the way back, at least 65,000 years: from rendering poisonous seeds edible, to the aerodynamic genius of the boomerang, to the environmentally attuned practise of 'firestick farming', which still informs CSIRO's controlled burning practices today.

Australia's first people invented incredible breakthroughs to support life down under.

Even as Australia became more connected to other nations, we took pride in our own ingenuity.

In fact, let me tell you briefly about one invention that was masterminded not in isolation to the rest of the world, but right under its very nose.

In the 1940s and 50s, the textiles industry was disrupted by synthetics, most notably the invention of polyester.

Australia's wool industry had to respond—but the process of spinning wool into fabric hadn't changed in more than 200 years, since the 'spinning jenny' was invented in England in 1764.

Then one wet Wednesday in February 1961, CSIRO physicists David Henshaw and Gordon Walls unravelled the challenge that had tied their peers up in knots.

Instead of reinventing the spinning process, they reinvented the wool itself.

They called it self-twisting yarn, created with a new kind of machine.

The pair were given a shed with a workbench, hidden at the back of the crowded CSIRO buildings in Geelong where they secretly tinkered with the new machine.

They formed a partnership with Repco and built six machines, all hidden out the back of the Geelong site.

The team wore suits made from the new yarn, which none of the experts in their building realised—nor did the hundreds of overseas textile experts visiting the site.

The Prime Minister, Sir Robert Menzies, was given Clan Menzies tartan curtains for his study made from the new self-twisting yarn—but not even he was told of the new process.

Finally, after feeding thousands of metres of fabric into commercial outlets, CSIRO revealed its machine to the public in 1970.

It was smaller, quieter, used less power, and spun wool 12 times faster than anything on the planet.

By 1976, more than 1,600 machines had been exported and Australian wool was once again competitive with synthetics, breathing new life into one of Australia's greatest industries, and securing wool industry jobs for generations yet to come.

But the story doesn't end there.

The following decade, we developed 'Sirospun' to spin and twist yarns in one operation, cutting costs by 40%.

And it still isn't over—as you'll see later today.

Australia's history shows we have a rich heritage of innovation—so why have we self-twisted this yarn?

Why are we more comfortable adopting other people's innovation than investing in our own?

Maybe it's complacency bred from our world record economic growth; or maybe we've become sceptical about the value of innovation.

Whatever the cause, Australians don't look to science for solutions the way they used to anymore.

And what's wrong with that, I hear you ask.

Why should we risk money inventing things here when we can ride on

the coattails of other countries who do it better anyway?

Let me tell you about another place where scientific endeavour was the envy of the world.

The Library at Alexandria was lauded as a citadel of scientific revelation in its day.

And yet, Carl Sagan wrote that with all that potential at their fingertips:

"The vast population of the city had not the vaguest notion of the great discoveries taking place within the Library...

"The scientists never grasped the potential of machines to free people.

"The great intellectual achievements of antiquity had few immediate practical applications.

"Science never captured the imagination of the multitude...

"When, at long last, the mob came to burn the Library down, there was nobody to stop them."

But after the flames burned out, and the ashes were scattered to the four winds—so too Alexandria, the greatest city the world had seen—was nothing, no hope, no future—gone, in a moment of madness.

I heard the story of Alexandria when I was a kid in primary school, and it gave me a profound sense of loss, until someone inspired me once more.

It was my science teacher, Sally Kerwin, who made me love Physics.

Cast your own minds back—I bet each of you remembers a teacher who inspired you, who changed the way you saw the world, who lit a spark of curiosity that still sparkles today.

When I interned at CSIRO in 1984, my supervisor, John McCallum taught me: if you don't deliver it, you haven't really done it.

Science innovation is different to other definitions of innovation—it creates new value that grows the economy—it's literally the gift that keeps on giving.

When I saw the deep impact CSIRO's science was having on industry, it gave me a sense of the higher purpose of science to transform lives.

It fired my conviction that science should never be hidden from the people, as it was in Alexandria, but instead, a visible part of making life better.

It was a lesson I'd learn over and over again.

My PhD advisor Jim Piper taught me that science solves problems.

And thank you Jim, for being an inspiration, and for being here today.

Later, my PhD examiner at Stanford, Bob Byer taught me scientists create companies.

When I visit classrooms, I see that love of science burning brightly in the eyes of students as they begin to understand the rich complexity of the world around them.

But fewer students are following that passion into university, and fewer still into their careers.

That last lesson—that science creates companies—isn't one we teach here in Australia.

I lived that lesson for 26 years, commercialising science in Silicon Valley.

The invention that got me hooked on founding companies was the world's first solid-state green laser to cure blindness in diabetics.

Our product was so unique, so high value, enabled by science solving an impossible problem that we could afford to manufacture it domestically, driving local jobs, and economic growth.

Innovation is about highest value not lowest price, lowest price is a race to the bottom.

Silicon Valley's foundation was the silicon chip, the science that created Intel.

Intel manufactured domestically, retrained automotive and white goods workers and created massive economic value.

Scientists create companies; Science creates Industries; Industries create the jobs of the future.

Then Intel expanded to Israel, and laid the foundation for Israel's own innovation ecosystem.

Science created thriving ecosystems that drove platforms of prosperity for

generations.

In Australia, we don't have that ecosystem... not yet.

But CSIRO can do for Australia what Intel did for Silicon Valley and Israel.

I'm not saying we should copy other countries' innovation, that's not very innovative.

We have our own potential, our own strengths, and our own opportunities—Australia will be its own, unique ecosystem.

But as our traditional Australian industries are disrupted, we must not allow other countries to seize the opportunities we have at our fingertips.

The world is racing to turn their science into solutions, if we don't keep up, we will lose our place in the world.

I said we were writing a new chapter for CSIRO—it's about three changes: speed, market vision, and reinvention.

First speed—because we are in an innovation race—we're increasing speed through two new programs, with support from the National Innovation and Science Agenda.

Two years ago, we created the national science accelerator, called ON.

ON teaches Australian scientists how to build a bridge from lab bench to customer.

It's designed to take the best ideas from the whole Australian research sector out into market, speeding up their ability to make a difference in people's lives.

More than 200 teams, from 30 institutions, have taken their benchtop breakthroughs to beta concepts.

It brings the entire research sector closer to Australian industry—aiming squarely at our ranking as one of the lowest collaborating nations in the OECD.

These amazing solutions from science include:

- A polymer you spray onto soil to lock in moisture and fertiliser for crops, while reducing evaporation and nutrient run-off into nearby bodies of water, like the Great Barrier Reef.

It's called TranspiratiONal. And from growing melons in Finley, NSW,

to tomatoes Echuca, Victoria, TranspiratiONal is transforming agriculture.

Sedimentary run-off is the most consistent threat to the Great Barrier Reef, so we care a lot about it.

- There's a livestock feed supplement made from seaweed that's lower cost and more nutritious, and reduces methane emissions from cattle.

It's called FutureFeed, and it's going to really help beef production and reduce our national emissions.

- And there's a facial recognition technology that identifies when non-verbal patients are in pain. It's called ePat, and it accelerated so fast, it's already delivered a product to market and exited on the ASX.

These are just three examples out of 200 teams delivering Australia's brilliant science into the hands of real people where it can solve real problems.

And they're creating some of the jobs of the future, in AgTech, eco-farming and MedTech.

But we also know that in Australia, science is perceived as a risky investment.

That's why last week we launched Main Sequence Ventures, the national Innovation Fund, also created by NISA.

The Fund is designed to bridge the challenges that many deep science ideas face when starting up.

It will support new start-ups, and existing SMEs engaged in the translation of science from all Australian Universities, once again, strengthening our national innovation ecosystem.

The Fund will back great Australian science—because science creates new industries, new companies and new jobs.

Very appropriately the Fund includes money created by another Australian innovation, WiFi.

Like WiFi, the name of the Fund comes from space science.

Few stars make it to the Main Sequence, but when they do, they burn longer and brighter, and nurture growth for all around them.

Growth of Australia's own, unique

innovation strengths—a lot like that shed, out the back in Geelong.

Last week we announced the first investments:

- Q-CRTL is developing firmware to control the chaos of quantum computing;
- Morse Micro is developing low-energy WiFi to connect everything to everything;
- Intersective provides experiential learning to retrain us for those jobs of the future; and
- Maxwell MRI is using Artificial Intelligence to detect prostate cancer.

Again, we can see here the industries of the future: quantum computing, the internet of things, and better healthcare through Artificial Intelligence.

So with ON taking Australian research from benchtop to beta; and Main Sequence Ventures funding the jump from beta to buyer; CSIRO is speeding up the creation the industries of the future.

The second change I want to talk about is market vision; a fundamental shift from science push, to market pull.

Companies like Intel had a vision of computers that others couldn't see because it was impossible—but science makes the impossible, possible.

So Intel used science to make their vision happen.

We have a market vision for Australia's future, one that's already beginning to deliver.

To deepen the connection between our science and the needs of industry, over the past 12 months we've developed a series of Industry Roadmaps, in partnership with Industry Growth Centres.

They pinpoint Australia's opportunities to transform our major industries with science, and there's a common thread running through them—sometimes it's self-twisting wool, sometimes carbon fibre.

Commodities compete on price—unique products compete on value.

Science creates new value.

In the past, we've unleashed our science on the world as an idea, undevel-

oped like a raw material dug from the ground.

And much like our mineral wealth, which we've dug up and shipped away, our ideas have realised their potential elsewhere, creating value, jobs and opportunity in other countries.

This isn't sustainable.

For decades, we've made money exporting mineral sands, worth pennies per pound.

It's time to shift our focus to creating our own high value products.

We started with a small step, by turning sand into titanium ink for 3D printing (show bottle of ink).

Then we thought bigger, and created this replacement sternum (show sternum) that saved a young woman in NYC—a first for the US.

And in so doing, propelling a small Aussie SME called Anatomics to the world stage.

We've seen where this story leads before: Intel turned sand, into a unique high value material, silicon.

With the right market vision, science is the fulcrum to pivot our economy.

Now I can tell you the rest of the wool story...

After reinventing wool, we partnered with another Aussie SME called Textor to invent a novel way to weave paper in three dimensions.

The novel process required a completely new approach to manufacturing, but the resulting paper was so absorbent, it's now being used in nappies around the world by Kimberly Clarke.

But that's still not the end of the story, because next they looked at new kind of fibre.

Carbon fibre is a next generation material, delivering ultra-low weight, superb stiffness, and high conductivity.

It's being used in everything from bicycles and tennis rackets; to wind turbine blades; right through to my personal favourite: aviation and space.

In fact, we've already helped yet another Aussie SME, Carbon Revolution, to develop carbon fibre wheels, for the latest model Ford Mustang.

But, carbon fibre is only made by a

handful of manufacturers around the world, each of whom hold their own secret, patented recipe.

In partnership with Deakin University, CSIRO has cracked the carbon fibre code.

Today, I'm thrilled to reveal one of the first pieces of carbon fibre made from scratch in Australia, from Australia's own top secret recipe. (Show carbon fibre.)

Just as their forebears created new industries and jobs in wool with their invention, the CSIRO and Deakin team has taken the first step towards reinventing generations of new jobs in carbon fibre manufacturing here in Australia—not very far, in fact, from that historic shed in Geelong.

It's also worth noting that our Advanced Manufacturing Industry Roadmap has mapped the path for carbon fibre in Australia over the coming years, and the future is in good shape.

So we're picking up the pace with ON and Main Sequence Ventures, and we're delivering higher value and vision to industry.

The third and final change I want to talk about today is the power of science to reinvent.

Science creates new value when it makes the impossible possible.

It inspires us to take leaps of faith into the future, well beyond what seems possible today.

It inspired me as a kid in primary school, watching the Moon landing.

And it inspires kids in schools today, entranced by our Pluto fly-by or the Cassini crash into Saturn—all three of which were received, by the way, by Australia's national science agency right here in the ACT, as part of our 50 year partnership with NASA.

So to ensure our reach exceeds our gaze, we've created six Future Science Platforms, or FSPs, each closely aligned with the market vision we created for re-inventing each of Australia's major industries.

Now I could tell you about Environments, or Synthetic Biology or Deep Earth Imaging or Digiscape or Probing Biosystems or Active Inte-

grated Matter—but we'll never get to your questions if I go into that kind of detail.

So suffice it to say the 60 or so scientists we've hired to realise these ambitions are making outstanding progress.

Instead, let me do you one better and tell you about two new FSPs that we haven't even announced yet, which are designed to create industries that don't even exist yet.

The first is Hydrogen Energy.

We invented the hydrogen "cracker"—it creates hydrogen from ammonia.

Ammonia is already transported all around the world using existing liquid fuel infrastructure, so it's faster in every sense than charging an electric car.

In May, we launched a project with BOC, Hyundai and Toyota to turn ammonia into fuel for cars.

Not only is hydrogen a renewable energy source, but it's also energy storage, something we need to stabilise the grid as we introduce more renewables.

Those same renewables—like solar energy—can produce hydrogen directly, enabling Aussie sunshine to be exported around the world as a renewable liquid energy.

The second new industry is Precision Health—creating a healthier future for all Australians.

We all know Australia has exceptional medical research, but it is largely focused on treatment rather than prevention.

We're creating new foods and new diagnostics to reduce diabetes, obesity,

infectious diseases and certain cancers.

In fact, we've demonstrated the first scientific proof that data saves lives.

We developed new software tools to accurately forecast demand and help ensure access to emergency care and a hospital bed, and we're currently rolling this out in Queensland hospitals.

The tools have 90% accuracy, and if the entire country used the tool, we could save a huge \$23 million from the health budget every year.

In partnership with universities and industry, our Future Science Platforms are imagining—and creating—the industries of the future, that will grow the jobs of the future, that we and our children need.

We'll have more to share tomorrow about our \$5 million investment in these two new FSPs later this week.

So I hope today I've reassured you, and perhaps even intrigued you, that your National Science Agency is:

1. Speeding up the delivery of solutions from science,
2. Has a market vision to see the global changes, before they hit us, so the science is ready when they do; and
3. Is reinventing industries to deliver the jobs of the future.

I hope you're also a little more optimistic about Australia's future now that you've had a glimpse of these ephemeral "jobs of the future".

How our children's imaginations will turn the commodities of old into custom aerospace or electric car components, or unique foods that extend life itself, or export 100% renewable

clean fuels to power the engine of the world.

But my biggest hope is that as a nation, we will start to back ourselves again—because if we don't, we can't possibly succeed in tomorrow's world.

We may have grown complacent, and we may be a little sceptical about innovation in an era of automation.

That might be what they thought in Alexandria, but we've come a long way since then.

CSIRO has opened the doors of the library. You don't need a library card, you don't even need to be quiet—in fact we want to hear you loud and clear.

Your national science agency is exactly that: Yours.

We're here to make science deliver the jobs of the future that you and all Australians need, today and in the future, regardless of skills, expertise, or background.

If we don't back our own abilities, we will see these industries—and the jobs they create—being developed in other countries, at our expense.

In times of change, it's easy to forget that we've been here before.

We've been disrupted.

We've reinvented old industries, and we've created new ones.

We've woven our own success and we've spun out new industries—and not just the ones relating to fibre.

We can—we must—we will—do it again.

Thank you.